



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JULY 23, 2019

No. 124

House of Representatives

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. DEAN).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 23, 2019.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MADELEINE DEAN to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2019, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 1:50 p.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

HOPE REMAINS FOR PEACE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. POCAN. Madam Speaker, today we will be taking up a resolution to denounce the BDS movement, the boycott, divestment, and sanctions against Israel.

This region is not unfamiliar to me, as I have been there twice, in both Israel and Palestine. I do not support the BDS movement.

When I was last in Palestine, I asked multiple people with whom I met if

they supported the movement, and the response was that they did not, as they were afraid of the economic effect on Palestine, where many are already struggling.

However, I also do not support the resolution today, as it goes too far, in my opinion, in telling people what they can or should think or say about the situation in Israel.

Israel the country and the Israeli people are good friends of the United States. They are a strong democracy and a close ally of our country. I have supported the Iron Dome as a way to deescalate the tensions that occur when a rocket is sent into Israel from inside Gaza, for example. It is better to take out that missile before there is any damage or death rather than returning a volley of rockets back in response, injuring or killing people of both countries.

But I also think it is okay to be critical of the Netanyahu administration, or government, and their policies.

Look, if a dear friend does something that jeopardizes themselves or their family's lives or livelihoods, I have a moral obligation to say something because I respect my friend. It should be no different with our response to Israel. People have a right to be concerned about a number of actions by the Israeli Government.

We have a right to question how continuing to create illegal settlements into the West Bank will make it harder to broker a two-state solution, the best path forward toward peace in the region, given the additional difficulty of the land swaps.

We have a right to question why it is okay to take Palestinian children, or any child, into a military court for detention by Israel.

We have a right to ask if sectioning off 2 million people in Gaza, with over a million people needing food assistance and 95 percent not having access to clean water, will ever lead to peace,

or why not allowing Members of Congress to go into Gaza from Israel is smart. What don't they want us to see by not allowing us in?

We have a right to ask how demolishing Palestinian homes in East Jerusalem or the West Bank or crops in Gaza serves to further peace in the region.

We have a right to ask why it makes sense to have a major highway with a giant wall in the middle of it with one side for Palestinians and the other for Israelis, as it looks like something we have judged poorly previously in history.

We have a right to ask if a bullet directed at a child is an equivalent response to a thrown rock.

I am not saying that Hamas, the organization that has been recognized by the United States as a terrorist organization, is innocent or pure—anything but. But, obviously, not all Palestinians are Hamas by any stretch of the imagination.

If we really want peace in the region, where we will never have to send young men and women from our country to risk their lives, then we need a government in Israel that respects human rights more and works more aggressively towards peace.

I was told a resolution advocating for a two-state solution would be up today as well, a resolution I support; but apparently it is not, and that is a mistake. Instead, only this resolution opposing BDS is up.

And while I do not support BDS, I cannot support this resolution as worded. My hope is that we will have real peace in the region someday, that we will have a two-state solution where both Israelis and Palestinians will live in peace, both internally and with each other. But this resolution won't do that.

Madam Speaker, I just wish real efforts toward peace were what we were debating today.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H7163

HONORING HENRY LOZANO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. GOMEZ) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOMEZ. Madam Speaker, on July 19, surrounded by loved ones, the city of Los Angeles lost a giant. His name was Henry Lozano.

Madam Speaker, I simply don't have enough time to recount all of Henry's achievements or the profound impact he had on our district and on the Golden State. His list of accomplishments is pretty impressive.

He was a Korean war veteran, serving as a Marine corporal in the 1950s; a fierce workers' advocate as a labor leader for UAW Local 509; chief of staff to Congressman Ed Roybal; an adviser to Xavier Becerra, the current attorney general of California and the former Congressman for the district I now represent.

Congressman Ed Roybal was the first Latino elected to Congress from California since the 1800s, a founder of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus. Oftentimes, I say I stand on the shoulders of giants, and people think I am referring just to the elected officials who came before me; but, more often than not, it is the people who surround those elected leaders, like Henry Lozano, the ones who are their advisers, their confidantes, the people who try to keep them true to their word and to their core and to their principles.

Henry was that type of individual. He cared deeply about the Latino community and empowering them in a time where we oftentimes felt marginalized. He came up during the seventies and the eighties and the nineties.

I did not work with Henry directly, but I got to know him. Back in 2004, at the Democratic National Convention, I was introduced to Henry by a mutual friend, and he said that Henry was a legend within the Latino community on the east side of Los Angeles. He said he was the one who helped, really, mentor countless elected officials and wannabe elected officials like myself.

I befriended Henry, and Henry gave me quite a bit of advice. Most importantly, he wanted to make sure that I would remain truthful and remain committed to the community that I would one day represent.

I got to visit him just before he passed in the hospital. He looked pretty good to me. We talked, and the first thing he asked me about is what did I think. I thought he was referring to the Presidential election, but, in the end, it was really about a local city council race.

He said that politics is always local, and you should always think about the people first.

Henry will be missed. He had a profound impact on a lot of folks, and I am one of them. So I hope that we will keep his memory alive.

HONORING BARBARA TORRES

Mr. GOMEZ. Madam Speaker, I have sad news to report regarding someone

else we lost on the east side of Los Angeles.

She was a labor union leader, an activist, and a daughter of East Los Angeles. Her name was Barbara Torres.

Barbara passed away at the young age of 39, but she left a life of meaning. She was always around, even though she didn't have a car. She gave so much to people who had so little, even though she didn't have much herself.

She fought against the biggest opponents, even though she was small in stature. She would often be the first one into a fight because she always had one saying: "If we fight, we win." That really sums up Barbara Torres.

She was the champion of the little guy and the underdog, because she was the little guy and the underdog. She understood that the system can sometimes be against the people who need the most help, but she was always there and never gave up faith.

She valued her community, but we also valued her in return.

Yesterday, we put Barbara Torres to rest. At her funeral service was the mayor of Los Angeles, Eric Garcetti, myself, Los Angeles City Council President Herb Wesson, State Senator Maria Elena Durazo, as well as Assembly Member Reggie Jones-Sawyer and the head of the California Democratic Party, Rusty Hicks.

For somebody who did not have a title in the end, who was not of wealth or means but was just somebody who showed up every single day for every fight, she left an impact. She will definitely be missed because we know that she made California, Los Angeles, and this country a better place to live.

PRESERVE FREE SPEECH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB) for 5 minutes.

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, I stand before you as the granddaughter of a Palestinian grandmother, my sity, who yearns to experience equality, human dignity, and freedom. I stand before you, the daughter of Palestinian immigrants, parents who experienced being stripped of their human rights, the right to freedom of travel and equal treatment. So I can't stand by and watch this attack on our freedom of speech and the right to boycott the racist policies of the Government and the State of Israel.

I love our country's freedom of speech, Madam Speaker. Dissent is how we nurture democracy and grow to be better, more humane, and just. This is why I oppose H. Res. 246.

All Americans have a constitutional right, guaranteed by the First Amendment, to freedom of speech, to petition their government, and to participate in boycotts.

Speech in pursuit of civil and human rights at home and abroad is protected by our First Amendment. That is one reason why our First Amendment is so powerful. With a few exceptions, the

government is simply not allowed to discriminate against speech based on its viewpoint or its speaker.

The right to boycott is deeply rooted in the fabric of our country. What was the Boston Tea Party but a boycott? Where would we be now without the boycott led by civil rights activists in the 1950s and 1960s, like the Montgomery bus boycott and United Farm Workers grape boycott.

Some of this country's most important advances in racial equality and equity and workers' rights have been achieved through collective action protected by our Constitution.

Americans of conscience have a long and proud history of participating in boycotts specifically to advocate for human rights abroad. Americans boycotted Nazi Germany in response to dehumanization, imprisonment, and genocide of Jewish people. In the 1980s, many of us in this very body boycotted South African goods in the fight against apartheid.

Our right to free speech is being threatened with this resolution. It sets a dangerous precedent because it attempts to delegitimize certain people's political speech and to send a message that our government can and will take action against speech it doesn't like.

Madam Speaker, the Supreme Court has, time and time again, recognized that expressive conduct is protected by the Constitution, from burning a flag to baking a cake. Efforts to restrict and target that protected speech run the risk of eroding the civil rights that form the foundation of our democracy.

All Americans have the right to participate in boycotts, and I oppose all legislative efforts that target speech.

Madam Speaker, I urge Congress, State governments, and civil rights leaders from all communities to preserve our Constitution, preserve our Bill of Rights, and preserve the First Amendment's guarantee of freedom of speech by opposing H. Res. 246 and antiboycott efforts wherever they arise.

□ 1215

HONORING THE LIFE OF CORPORAL WILLIAM "BILL" MCMILLAN, III

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. NORMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life of Corporal William "Bill" McMillan, III. Corporal McMillan was a combat medic serving in Iraq when he lost his life in an IED attack on July 8, 2008.

The death of Corporal McMillan prompted his father, Lloyd, and Brad, his older brother, to write a poem about his sudden death entitled "The Medic's Last Patrol." It goes like this: As your Stryker rolls, you remember many missions through this long, tough fight.

You know the last task will come, last work be done, then home. All right!

You will mount up to take that last patrol with fellows all well tried;

That honor roll of troopers you have come to know with love and pride.

You have all talked, laughed, wept, and fought hard, side by side.

Many times before, you've watched them play, work, fight, and bleed.

You've patched them up, cheered them on, and sent them back to lead.

You've been there for them in the dust of day and in the cold of night.

Then on to the next patrol, with that honored roll. Back one more time to fight.

You remember. The report was out. They were all about, and they had planted one to three.

On late guard, near break of day, an IED you see they start to lay.

You call Sarge, "Hey! Look close over there. Can you see?"

Sarge runs right out, and starts to shout, "That's it!" And you do the follow me!

Later, you patch the enemy then work smart, fight tough, to get yourself free.

You ask, "Is this the last patrol? Is this it for the Sarge and me?"

Experience kicks in. You both fight hard and win. Clearly, the last patrol it's not.

You and your team will see lots more patrols, as that's the soldier's lot.

As you're grouped the next day, the General praises your brave acts.

You and Sarge got four, and the team got nine more, in those all-out attacks.

Your team did its job. They fought hard and did so very well.

You've sent the enemy on their last patrol, their justly deserved death knell.

Now, you are rolling on this new daytime mission. The light is oh so bright.

Your patrol is off to guard the convoy, checking all that is in sight.

You laugh at stories told as along you roll and grab a snack. All right!

Then that flash of light, that blast of might, your eyes they see now closed so tight.

For four, the last patrol has come. The rest for a moment numb, a truly terrible plight.

Later, the caisson rolls. The cannons boom. Overhead, the Blackhawks fly.

We honor you as we stand in place. But we ask, O God! Tell us why.

We find some comfort as we hear "Amazing Grace," our eyes very far from dry.

It was a one-way ticket, but we know you're in a better place.

Now, you are with our dear Lord and holy master.

You have passed from last patrol to honored guard of God's most holy pasture.

FOCUS ON HUMAN RIGHTS IN DISCUSSIONS WITH PAKISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHERMAN. Madam Speaker, the Prime Minister of Pakistan, Imran Khan, came to Washington this week-end. As chair of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Asia, it is appropriate that I comment upon what has occurred so far in the bilateral discussions, and I look forward to meeting the Prime Minister later today.

What is unfortunate is the approach taken by the Trump administration.

First, as to Afghanistan, the hearts and minds of the Afghan people are

critical to our success in what has been our longest war. Tens of thousands of Americans have worked to get the hearts and minds of the Afghan people on our side, building schools and hospitals, under very dangerous conditions.

Now, the President takes this high-profile opportunity as an opportunity to say that he might kill 10 million Afghans, or was thinking about it, or raises the possibility that we would use nuclear weapons to destroy Afghanistan.

This does untold harm to our efforts in Afghanistan to win the hearts and minds of the Afghan people.

What the President should have done is talk about the Durand Line and how Afghanistan should accept this border between Afghanistan and Pakistan, a border that Afghanistan disputes but that the whole world accepts.

As to Kashmir, it is not surprising that the Prime Minister of Pakistan wants America to arbitrate or mediate. That has been the position of Pakistan for decades. But then, the President said in Osaka, last month, Prime Minister Modi asked the United States to arbitrate or mediate the Kashmir dispute.

That is utterly preposterous, and it is embarrassing that we have a President who wouldn't realize how preposterous that statement is. Of course, the record has been set straight by Prime Minister Modi.

Third is what the President didn't say. He didn't make a major issue over Dr. Afridi, the doctor who was critical in helping us find and kill Osama bin Laden. Bin Laden was hiding a mile away from the military academy of the Pakistani Army, their West Point.

We have not demanded that the Pakistanis who helped Osama bin Laden be put in jail, but we do insist that the one Pakistani who helped us find bin Laden be released from Pakistani jail.

The President barely raised the issue. In fact, he didn't voluntarily raise it at all.

This is not just a humanitarian concern. It is also a strategic national security concern because who will help us fight terrorism if we leave Dr. Afridi behind?

In a news interview, Prime Minister Khan suggested there might be a trade, where Afridi was released and a terrorist named Dr. Siddiqui released by the United States.

No friendly country would demand that we release a terrorist in order for them to release a hero, but we have to be practical, and we have to get Dr. Afridi released.

Finally, the President failed to mention with the Prime Minister of Pakistan the situation as to human rights. Hundreds of individuals in Sindh have been forcibly disappeared by Pakistani authorities.

A prime example of that I should highlight today is a 17-year-old boy from Sindh, Aqib Chandio. He was abducted 14 months ago, in broad daylight. He is still missing.

It is time for the Prime Minister of Pakistan to provide information about Aqib Chandio. Where is he? Produce him in court or release him. What is his fate?

Of course, we need information about hundreds of others who have disappeared, including Murtaza Junejo, Shahid Junejo, Ayoub Kandhro, and Insaaf Dayo.

I want to mention Dr. Anwar Laghari, a friend of mine who was shot dead in Sindh in 2015 while working with the Sindh United Party, a party of which he was one of the leaders. Pakistan has not adequately investigated that brutal murder, and it is time for Pakistan to do so.

Finally, we focus on the issue of forced conversions in Sindh, young Hindu and Christian girls forced to convert to Islam and forced to marry men many decades their senior. The Pakistani Government needs to stop this pernicious practice. They need to do more. That is why nine of my colleagues joined with me in sending a letter to the President, urging a focus on human rights in Sindh in these bilateral discussions.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

We give You thanks, O God, for giving us another day. We ask Your blessing upon this assembly and upon all to whom the authority of government is given.

Encourage the Members of this House, O God, to use their abilities and talents in ways that bring righteousness to this Nation and to all people.

Ever remind them of the needs of the poor, the homeless or forgotten, and those who live without freedom or liberty. May they be instruments of justice for all Americans.

We are grateful for the success of the recent negotiations between the President and congressional leaders on the debt limit and budget caps deal and ask Your blessing on them and on those now charged with moving the business of government and the national economy forward.

May all that is done within the people's House this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. BAIRD. Madam Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BAIRD. Madam Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Utah (Mr. McADAMS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. McADAMS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

WE MUST ACT ON BIPARTISAN HEALTHCARE SOLUTIONS

(Mr. McADAMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. McADAMS. Madam Speaker, passage of the Affordable Care Act nearly a decade ago, while not a perfect bill, helped thousands of Utah families gain insurance coverage, many for the first time, and I am working in Congress to ensure we meet the law's goals to improve access to care and protect all Americans' coverage, particularly those with preexisting conditions.

Utah's hardworking families struggle with the rising costs of care, fueled to a large degree by skyrocketing prescription drug prices.

Everywhere I go, people talk about how the cost of an illness or an accident sparks the fear of being one health crisis away from financial ruin.

That is why I have voted for a dozen bills to seek to lower the cost of prescription drugs and strengthen consumer protections, and I urge my Senate colleagues to act, too.

I continue to meet with Utahns about their healthcare concerns, and I recently had a conversation with moms of kids with type 1 diabetes, who explained to me how the high cost of insulin is affecting their child's treatment.

We have a bipartisan consensus that our healthcare system needs work, so it is past time that we act on bipartisan solutions that lower Americans' costs and ensure their access to quality, affordable healthcare.

FOR THE PEOPLE AGENDA IN ACTION

(Mr. SARBANES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, last year, the American people embraced the Democrats' For the People agenda: lower healthcare costs, raise wages, and clean up corruption.

Americans hate corruption. They hate the idea that people are cutting the line, breaking the rules, and getting ahead, cheating on the system. They want to see us clean that up in Washington.

And they sent us last year with a very, very powerful message. Three things, they said:

The first was: Make it so that I can get to the ballot box in America without running an obstacle course. Make it easier to register and vote in this country.

And in H.R. 1, the For the People Act, we did that. We put that proposal forward to strengthen voting.

The second thing they said was: When you get to Washington, behave yourselves. It is that simple. Be ethical, be accountable, and answer to the people.

So we put ethics reforms into H.R. 1, the For the People Act.

The last thing they said was: When you get to Washington, don't get tangled up in the money. Remember where you came from. Work for us, not the special interests and the insiders and the lobbyists.

And we fixed that in H.R. 1. That was part of the For the People agenda.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO JUDGE AVERN COHN

(Mr. LEVIN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Judge Avern Cohn, who turns 95 years young today and marks 40 years of service in the Eastern District of Michigan.

Although he has technically been on senior status for two decades, Judge Cohn maintains a remarkably active docket, and his Chambers are a landmark for anyone interested in an astounding range of history, legal doctrine, and public policy.

I count myself among the many Michiganders, from all communities and stations of life, who know room 218 is the place to go when you have a particularly thorny problem to solve or need advice on a sensitive matter. You just have to be ready because the judge dispenses his wisdom unvarnished.

Judge Cohn's work ethic is legendary. In any room, he is generally both the most well-read person on history, philosophy, culture, and also, somehow, the most up to date on current affairs, as he devours numerous newspapers and websites every day.

It is hard to overstate Judge Cohn's impact on the law and the people who have passed through his courtroom, whether they be defendants, attorneys, or staff. He has left an indelible imprint on so many lives.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Judge Cohn on 40 years of service and in wishing him continued success.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PERLMUTTER). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or votes objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

BUILDING BLOCKS OF STEM ACT

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1665) to direct the National Science Foundation to support STEM education research focused on early childhood.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1665

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Building Blocks of STEM Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The National Science Foundation is a large investor in STEM education and plays a key role in setting research and policy agendas.

(2) While studies have found that children who engage in scientific activities from an early age develop positive attitudes toward science and are more likely to pursue STEM expertise and careers later on, the majority of current research focuses on increasing STEM opportunities for middle school-aged children and older.

(3) Women remain widely underrepresented in the STEM workforce, and this gender disparity extends down through all levels of education.

SEC. 3. SUPPORTING EARLY CHILDHOOD STEM EDUCATION RESEARCH.

In awarding grants under the Discovery Research PreK-12 program, the Director of the National Science Foundation shall consider the age distribution of a STEM education research and development project to

improve the focus of research and development on early childhood education.

SEC. 4. SUPPORTING FEMALE STUDENTS IN PRE-KINDERGARTEN THROUGH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN STEM EDUCATION.

Section 305(d) of the American Innovation and Competitiveness Act (42 U.S.C. 1862s-5(d)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) RESEARCH.—As a component of improving participation of women in STEM fields, research funded by a grant under this subsection may include research on—

“(A) the role of teacher training and professional development, including effective incentive structures to encourage teachers to participate in such training and professional development, in encouraging or discouraging female students in prekindergarten through elementary school from participating in STEM activities;

“(B) the role of teachers in shaping perceptions of STEM in female students in prekindergarten through elementary school and discouraging such students from participating in STEM activities;

“(C) the role of other facets of the learning environment on the willingness of female students in prekindergarten through elementary school to participate in STEM activities, including learning materials and textbooks, classroom decorations, seating arrangements, use of media and technology, classroom culture, and gender composition of students during group work;

“(D) the role of parents and other caregivers in encouraging or discouraging female students in prekindergarten through elementary school from participating in STEM activities;

“(E) the types of STEM activities that encourage greater participation by female students in prekindergarten through elementary school;

“(F) the role of mentorship and best practices in finding and utilizing mentors;

“(G) the role of informal and out-of-school STEM learning opportunities on the perception of and participation in STEM activities of female students in prekindergarten through elementary school; and

“(H) any other area the Director determines will carry out the goal described in paragraph (1).”.

SEC. 5. SUPPORTING FEMALE STUDENTS IN PRE-KINDERGARTEN THROUGH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN COMPUTER SCIENCE EDUCATION.

Section 310(b) of the American Innovation and Competitiveness Act (42 U.S.C. 1862s-7(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) USES OF FUNDS.—The tools and models described in paragraph (2)(C) may include—

“(A) offering training and professional development programs, including summer or academic year institutes or workshops, designed to strengthen the capabilities of prekindergarten and elementary school teachers and to familiarize such teachers with the role of gender bias in the classroom;

“(B) offering innovative pre-service and in-service programs that instruct teachers on gender-inclusive practices for teaching computing concepts;

“(C) developing distance learning programs for teachers or students, including developing curricular materials, play-based computing activities, and other resources for the in-service professional development of teachers that are made available to teachers through the Internet;

“(D) developing or adapting prekindergarten and elementary school computer science curricular materials that incorporate contemporary research on the science of learning, particularly with respect to gender inclusion;

“(E) developing and offering gender-inclusive computer science enrichment programs for students, including after-school and summer programs;

“(F) providing mentors for female students in prekindergarten through elementary school in person and through the Internet to support such students in participating in computer science activities;

“(G) engaging female students in prekindergarten through elementary school and their guardians about the difficulties faced by such students to maintain an interest in participating in computer science activities;

“(H) acquainting female students in prekindergarten through elementary school with careers in computer science and encouraging such students to consider careers in such field;

“(I) developing tools to evaluate activities conducted under this subsection; and

“(J) any other tools or models the Director determines will accomplish the aim described in paragraph (2)(C).”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JOHNSON) and the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on H.R. 1665, the bill now under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support H.R. 1665, the Building Blocks of STEM Act.

Employment in computer and information technology jobs is projected to grow faster than any other occupation between the years of 2016 and 2026.

Despite the opportunity for good, high-paying jobs when they graduate, women earned only 19 percent of undergraduate computer science degrees in 2016.

Disturbingly, the ratio of women to men earning computer science degrees actually declined between 2006 and 2016.

H.R. 1665 devotes resources to ensure girls in prekindergarten and elementary school are exposed to STEM activities and encouraged to pursue STEM studies from a young age, before many are dissuaded or discouraged from doing so.

The legislation includes a focus on computer science education to help ensure we will have the talent to fill the jobs of the future.

We must act now to increase the participation of women in STEM, and it starts with the focus on early childhood education.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleagues, Representatives STEVENS and BAIRD, for their leadership in this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to

support it. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, research shows that early exposure to science, technology, engineering, mathematics, and computer science has positive impacts on a broad spectrum of student outcomes. For example, early math knowledge not only predicts later math success; it also predicts later reading achievement.

Studies have also found that children who engage in scientific activities from an early age develop positive attitudes towards science and are more likely to pursue STEM expertise and careers.

H.R. 1665, the Building Blocks of STEM Act, directs the National Science Foundation to support STEM education research focused on early childhood and to award grants to encourage young girls to pursue computer science learning.

Across the country, the share of STEM jobs has expanded significantly, with STEM employment increasing from 9.7 million to 17.3 million from 1990 to 2018.

Data suggests that this trend will continue, and the U.S. is struggling to meet that demand. To meet it, we must engage children—particularly young girls—in STEM in early childhood and sustain that interest as they grow.

More graduates with STEM degrees means more advanced American technologies and a more robust economy.

But it is not just about the economy. STEM graduates have the potential to develop technologies that could save thousands of lives, jump-start a new industry, or even discover new worlds.

By supporting more hands-on STEM engagement for younger ages, we are supporting and investing in America's future.

In the 115th Congress, the House passed this legislation unanimously, and I hope it will do so again today. I want to thank Representative BAIRD and Representative STEVENS for reintroducing this bipartisan bill and moving it forward.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. STEVENS).

Ms. STEVENS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1665, the Building Blocks of STEM Act, which supports STEM education research focused on early childhood education.

There is a lot of discussion about the gender disparity in the STEM workforce and the leaky pipeline that widens the gap as women and girls continue through school.

Although women make up half of the U.S. workforce, they make up less than a quarter of those employed in STEM occupations.

The Building Blocks of STEM Act addresses these disparities by ensuring an equitable distribution of STEM education research funding for projects focused on young children and helping us

understand why girls are encouraged or discouraged from participating in STEM activities.

It also ensures that the National Science Foundation grants are awarded to entities that are working in partnership, such as research universities with local education agencies, to increase participation in computer science education.

Computer science is particularly struggling to recruit and retain women, who make up less than 18 percent of the computer science workforce. The number is trending down, not up.

□ 1415

This has a ripple effect on our country's ability to fill the high-skilled jobs of today and tomorrow. We need the next generation of young women to pursue STEM degrees, and we are not seeing the numbers we need.

It is critical that we continue to work on STEM opportunities for middle-school-aged children and older, but we also need to ensure our Federal resources start at the beginning and support research on STEM education of younger students, starting at the beginning of their educational career.

We know this all too well in Michigan. We know the structural and cultural barriers that exist for women interested in STEM from a very young age. Lack of support, unconscious or conscious gender bias, and stereotype threats are just a few.

In several studies, when children were asked to draw a mathematician or a scientist, girls were twice as likely to draw a man as they were a woman, while boys almost universally drew men, often in a lab coat.

The science is clear that children who engage in scientific activities from an early age, before middle school, develop positive attitudes toward science and are more likely to pursue STEM experiences and career opportunities later on.

We need to be working toward interventions to increase the number of girls and women in these fields, and that is why I am so proud to sponsor this bill.

I thank Chairwoman JOHNSON for her leadership on the House Science Committee toward increasing STEM opportunities for women, particularly for women of color.

I introduced this bipartisan legislation with my colleague, Congressman JIM BAIRD, along with our counterparts in the Senate, Senators JACKY ROSEN and SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and in both Chambers of Congress to support this bill and send this important legislation swiftly to the President's desk.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BAIRD).

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1665, the Building Blocks of STEM Act.

I was proud to join my colleague, the chair of the Research and Technology Subcommittee, Representative HALEY STEVENS, in introducing this legislation.

As one of only two Members of Congress with a Ph.D. in science, I understand how important it is to start children off on the right foot by teaching STEM concepts and principles at an early age. Research shows that kids as young as 1, 2, or 3 are capable of absorbing STEM concepts. Children have a natural curiosity that can be fostered into an interest in science, technology, engineering, math, and computer science.

Equally important is ensuring that we get more girls involved in the STEM fields so that we can have as many people as possible contributing to the knowledge base of our society.

H.R. 1665 directs the NSF to fund research and studies that focus on early childhood and young women in STEM at the K-12 level. Investing in children early ensures that we are laying the groundwork to develop young innovators in STEM.

Hoosiers know that to grow our Nation, we need everyone involved. This bill helps ensure that we are preparing students to fill the jobs of the future, continuing America's global leadership in science and technology.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support this bill.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no more requests for time. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to close.

The love of learning starts young, and the Building Blocks of STEM bill promotes this by prioritizing a focus on early childhood STEM education. It gives us the opportunity to encourage girls to get and stay engaged in STEM, helping us to improve our educational programs and diversify the STEM workforce.

I, again, thank Representative BAIRD and Representative STEVENS for reintroducing this bipartisan bill.

As the House did in 2015, I encourage this body to support and pass this legislation unanimously.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member and the Members on both sides of the aisle for their support of this bill. I urge its passage, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JOHNSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1665.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMERICAN MANUFACTURING LEADERSHIP ACT

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2397) to amend the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act to make changes to the implementation of the network for manufacturing innovation, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2397

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "American Manufacturing Leadership Act".

SEC. 2. CHANGES IN IMPLEMENTATION OF MANUFACTURING USA.

Section 34 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278s) is amended—

(1) in the section heading by striking "NETWORK FOR MANUFACTURING INNOVATION" and inserting "MANUFACTURING USA NETWORK";

(2) by striking "centers for manufacturing innovation" each place it appears in subsections (a)(3)(B), (b)(1), (d), (g), and (i) and inserting "Manufacturing USA institutes";

(3) by striking "center for manufacturing innovation" each place it appears in subsections (d)(1), (d)(4)(E), (g), and (h)(1) and inserting "Manufacturing USA institute";

(4) by striking "center" each place it appears in subsection (d)(2), (d)(4)(E), and (d)(5) and inserting "Manufacturing USA institute";

(5) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by striking "NETWORK FOR MANUFACTURING INNOVATION PROGRAM" and inserting "MANUFACTURING USA PROGRAM";

(B) in paragraph (1), by striking "Network for Manufacturing Innovation Program" and inserting "Manufacturing USA Program";

(C) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (G), by striking "and" at the end;

(ii) in subparagraph (H), by striking the period at the end and inserting "; and"; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

"(I) to contribute to the development of regional manufacturing innovation clusters across the Nation."; and

(D) in paragraph (3)(A), by striking "Network for Manufacturing Innovation" and inserting "Manufacturing USA Network";

(6) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by striking "NETWORK FOR MANUFACTURING INNOVATION" and inserting "MANUFACTURING USA NETWORK"; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking "Network for Manufacturing Innovation" and inserting "Manufacturing USA Network";

(7) in subsection (c)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by striking "CENTERS FOR MANUFACTURING INNOVATION" and inserting "MANUFACTURING USA INSTITUTES";

(B) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking "center for manufacturing innovation" and inserting "Manufacturing USA institute" and inserting "Manufacturing USA institute" is an institute";

(ii) by striking "Secretary" each place it appears in subparagraph (C) and (D) and inserting "agency head";

(C) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking "center for manufacturing innovation" and inserting "Manufacturing USA institute";

(ii) by striking subparagraph (E);
 (iii) by redesignating subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), and (D) as clauses (i), (ii), (iii), and (iv), respectively, and moving the margins of such clauses (as so redesignated) two ems to the right;

(iv) in the matter preceding clause (i) (as so redesignated), by striking “Activities of a Manufacturing USA institute may include” and inserting the following:

“(A) REQUIRED ACTIVITIES.—Activities of a Manufacturing USA institute shall include”;

(v) in clause (i), as so redesignated, by striking “cost, time, and risk” and inserting “cost, time, or risk”;

(vi) in clause (ii), as so redesignated, by inserting before the period at the end the following: “addressing workforce needs through training and education programs at all appropriate education levels, including programs on applied engineering”;

(vii) in clause (iii), as so redesignated, by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, as appropriate”;

(viii) in clause (iv), as so redesignated, by striking “women and minority owned” and inserting “women, minority, and veteran owned”;

(ix) by inserting after clause (iv) (as so redesignated) the following:

“(v) Development of roadmaps or leveraging of existing roadmaps with respect to technology areas being pursued by that Manufacturing USA institute that take into account the research and development undertaken at other Manufacturing USA institutes and Federal agencies with respect to such areas.”; and

(x) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) PERMISSIBLE ACTIVITIES.—Activities of a Manufacturing USA institute may include such other activities as the agency head, in consultation with Federal departments and agencies whose missions contribute to, or are affected by, advanced manufacturing, considers consistent with the purposes described in subsection (a)(2).”; and

(D) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “centers for manufacturing innovation” and inserting “Manufacturing USA institutes”;

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking “center for manufacturing innovation” and inserting “Manufacturing USA institute”;

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) APPLICATION.—Effective beginning on the date of the enactment of the American Manufacturing Leadership Act, an institute shall be subject to subsections (a)(2), (c), and (d) in the same manner and to the same extent as such provisions apply to a Manufacturing USA institute established pursuant to this section if such institute—

“(i) is, as of such date of enactment, considered a Manufacturing USA institute under subparagraph (A) or recognized as a Manufacturing USA institute under subparagraph (B); and

“(ii) as of such date of enactment, receives Federal financial assistance under subsection (d) or otherwise consistent with the purposes of this section; or

“(iii) is under pending agency review for such recognition as of such date of enactment.”;

(8) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “Secretary” and inserting “agency head”;

(ii) by inserting “for a period of not less than 5 and not more than 7 years” after “financial assistance”;

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “Secretary” each place it appears and inserting “agency head”;

(C) by striking paragraph (3);

(D) in paragraph (4)—

(i) by amending subparagraph (A) to read as follows:

“(A) COMPETITIVE, MERIT REVIEW.—In awarding financial assistance under paragraph (1), the agency head shall—

“(i) use a competitive, merit review process that includes peer review by a diverse group of individuals with relevant expertise from both the private and public sectors; and

“(ii) ensure that the technology focus of a Manufacturing USA institute does not substantially duplicate the technology focus of any other Manufacturing USA institute.”;

(ii) in subparagraph (B)(i), by striking “Secretary” and inserting “agency head”;

(iii) by amending subparagraph (C) to read as follows:

“(C) PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT, TRANSPARENCY, AND ACCOUNTABILITY.—For each award of financial assistance under paragraph (1), the agency head shall develop and implement metrics-based performance standards to assess the effectiveness of activities funded in making progress toward the purposes of the Program, including the effectiveness of Manufacturing USA institutes in advancing technology readiness levels or manufacturing readiness levels.”;

(iv) in subparagraph (D), by striking “the Secretary shall” and all that follows through “collaborate” and inserting the following: “the agency head, in coordination with the National Program Office, as appropriate, shall collaborate”;

(v) in subparagraph (E)—

(I) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “Secretary” and inserting “agency head”;

(II) in clause (x), by striking “center for manufacturing” and inserting “Manufacturing USA institute”;

(E) in paragraph (5)—

(i) by amending subparagraph (A) to read as follows:

“(A) TERM OF AWARD.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clause (ii), an award made to a Manufacturing USA institute may be renewed for an additional period not to exceed the duration of the original funding award, subject to a rigorous merit review. In awarding additional funds, the agency head shall consider the extent to which the institute has made progress in achieving the purposes described in subsection (a) and carrying out the activities specified in subsection (c)(2).

“(ii) EXISTING INSTITUTES.—Notwithstanding clause (i), an institute already in existence or undergoing a renewal process on the date of enactment of the American Manufacturing Leadership Act—

“(I) may continue to receive support for the duration of the original funding award beginning on the date of establishment of that institute; and

“(II) shall be eligible for renewal of that funding pursuant to clause (i).”;

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking “Secretary” each place it appears and inserting “agency head”;

(iii) by striking subparagraph (C);

(9) by amending subsection (e) to read as follows:

“(e) GRANT PROGRAM FOR PUBLIC SERVICE ACTIVITIES FOR MANUFACTURING USA INSTITUTES WITHOUT FEDERAL FUNDING.—The Secretary may award grants on a competitive basis to Manufacturing USA institutes that are no longer recognized as such under subsection (c)(3)(C) to carry out workforce development, outreach to small- and medium-sized manufacturers, and other activities that—

“(1) are determined by the Secretary to be in the national interest; and

“(2) are unlikely to receive private sector financial support.”;

(10) in subsection (f)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “Network for Manufacturing Innovation Program” and inserting “Manufacturing USA Program”;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (E), by striking “and” at the end;

(ii) in subparagraph (F), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(G) to work with non-sponsoring Federal agencies to explore and develop options for sponsoring Manufacturing USA institutes at such agencies;

“(H) to work with sponsoring Federal agencies to develop and implement network-wide performance goals with measurable targets and timelines;

“(I) to help develop pilot programs that may be implemented by the Manufacturing USA institutes to address specific purposes of the Program, including to accelerate technology transfer to the private sector; and

“(J) to identify and disseminate best practices for workforce education and training across Manufacturing USA institutes and further enhance collaboration among Manufacturing USA institutes in developing and implementing such practices.”; and

(C) by amending paragraph (5) to read as follows:

“(5) HOLLINGS MANUFACTURING EXTENSION PARTNERSHIP.—The Secretary shall ensure that the National Program Office incorporates the Hollings Manufacturing Extension Partnership into Program planning to ensure—

“(A) significant outreach to, participation of, and engagement of small- and medium-sized manufacturers in Manufacturing USA institutes across the entirety of the manufacturing supply chain; and

“(B) that the results of the Program, including technologies developed by the Program, reach small- and medium-sized manufacturers and that such entities have access to technical assistance, as appropriate, in deploying those technologies.”;

(11) in subsection (g)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(A)—

(i) by striking “The Secretary” and all that follows through “report to the Secretary” and inserting the following: “Each agency head shall require each recipient of financial assistance from that agency under subsection (d)(1) and any other institutes considered to be Manufacturing USA institutes pursuant to subsection (c)(3) to annually submit to the appropriate agency head a report”;

(ii) by adding at the end the following: “Each agency head shall submit such reports to the Secretary.”;

(B) by amending paragraph (3) to read as follows:

“(3) ASSESSMENTS BY GAO.—

“(A) ASSESSMENTS.—Not less frequently than once every 3 years, the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress an assessment of the operation of the Program during the most recent 3-year period, including an assessment of the progress made towards achieving the goals specified in the national strategic plan for advanced manufacturing required under section 102(b)(7) of the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2010 (42 U.S.C. 6622(b)(7)).

“(B) ELEMENTS.—Each assessment submitted under subparagraph (A) shall include, for the period covered by the report—

“(i) a review of the management, coordination, and industry utility of the Program;

“(ii) an assessment of the extent to which the Program has furthered the purposes described in subsection (a)(2);

“(iii) such recommendations for legislative and administrative action as the Comptroller General considers appropriate to improve the Program; and

“(iv) an assessment as to whether any prior recommendations for improvement made by the Comptroller General have been implemented or adopted.”;

(12) in subsection (h)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking “subsection (e)” and inserting “subsection (k)”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(7) COLLABORATIONS WITH OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES.—The Secretary shall collaborate with Federal agencies whose missions contribute to, or are affected by, advanced manufacturing to identify and leverage existing resources at such Federal agencies to assist Manufacturing USA institutes in carrying out the purposes of the program specified in subsection (a)(2). Such existing resources may include programs—

“(A) at the Department of Labor relating to labor and apprenticeships;

“(B) at the Economic Development Administration relating to regional innovation, such as the Regional Innovation Strategies program;

“(C) at the Department of Education relating to workforce development, education, training, and retraining;

“(D) at the Department of Defense relating to procurement and other authorities of the Department of Defense;

“(E) at the Food and Drug Administration relating to biopharmaceutical manufacturing;

“(F) at the National Science Foundation, including the Advanced Technological Education program;

“(G) at the National Aeronautics and Space Administration relating to procurement, workforce development, education, training, and retraining; and

“(H) additional programs that the Secretary determines are appropriate to support the activities of existing Manufacturing USA institutes.”; and

(13) by adding at the end the following:

“(j) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) AGENCY HEAD.—The term ‘agency head’ means the head of any Executive agency (as defined in section 105 of title 5, United States Code), excluding the Department of Defense, that is providing financial assistance for a Manufacturing USA institute, including the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Energy.

“(2) REGIONAL INNOVATION CLUSTER.—The term ‘regional innovation cluster’ has the meaning given such term in section 27(f)(1) of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3722(f)(1)).

“(k) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

“(1) NIST.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this section \$25,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2024.

“(2) RESERVATION.—Of the amount made available under paragraph (1) the Secretary shall reserve not less than \$5,000,000 for the National Office of the Manufacturing USA Program established under subsection (f).

“(3) DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY.—For Manufacturing USA institutes operated by the Department of Energy, there are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Energy—

“(A) \$70,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2020, 2021, and 2022; and

“(B) \$84,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2023 and 2024.”.

SEC. 3. INCREASED EMPHASIS ON REGIONAL INNOVATION WITHIN AND EXTENSION OF REGIONAL INNOVATION PROGRAM.

Section 27 of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3722) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(2) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(I) Developing relationships at the local level to build supply chains and use existing capabilities of entities operating on that level to bring economic growth to suburban and rural areas.”; and

(2) in subsection (g)(2) by striking “2019” and inserting “2024”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JOHNSON) and the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 2397, the bill now under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 2397, the American Manufacturing Leadership Act.

I thank Ms. STEVENS for her leadership in introducing this bipartisan bill and for her commitment to developing legislation that will help strengthen America’s manufacturing base.

I also thank my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who have worked with us to develop and advance this important legislation.

Back in 2014, I was proud to support the original Revitalize American Manufacturing Innovation Act that established the Manufacturing USA program. That bipartisan bill was sponsored by TOM REED and JOE KENNEDY and was signed into law by President Obama.

Since its inception 5 years ago, the Manufacturing USA program has grown to support 14 manufacturing institutes focused on a variety of technology areas, ranging from 3D printing to groundbreaking energy-saving manufacturing processes.

H.R. 2397 would ensure the continued success of the Manufacturing USA program by reauthorizing the program for another 5 years and by allowing agencies to renew funding for institutes after reviewing the institutes’ progress on clear performance goals.

This bill also strengthens the ability of the institutes to leverage existing programs all across the Federal Government to improve their role in regional innovation, education and training, defense technology procurement, and other activities.

Today, manufacturing remains a vital component of our Nation’s econ-

omy and national security. H.R. 2397 will help to grow our manufacturing industry and to bring along with it many good-paying jobs for our workforce.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of H.R. 2397, the American Manufacturing Leadership Act. This legislation reauthorizes and amends the bipartisan Revitalize American Manufacturing Innovation Act of 2014.

Nationally, manufacturing supports nearly 13 million American jobs, or roughly 9 percent of the workforce, and represents about 11 percent of the American economy. Most of these firms are small manufacturers, supporting local economies by providing well-paying jobs.

Technology will continue to change this sector dramatically. Today’s manufacturing floor looks far different from the assembly lines of the past, and the skills needed by manufacturing workers will continue to change.

Innovative processes, such as additive manufacturing, are transforming the future of manufacturing. It is essential that these technologies are transferred to and adopted by all U.S. manufacturers so that we remain globally competitive and the number one destination for companies looking to carry out advanced manufacturing.

With manufacturers in the United States performing 64 percent of all private sector R&D in the Nation, it is important that we capitalize on these investments and reauthorize the network of public-private partnerships established in this act, which bolster manufacturing innovation.

This bill includes important reforms to better coordinate centers for manufacturing innovation funded by all relevant agencies and incorporates recommendations made by the Government Accountability Office to improve management. This bill also prioritizes manufacturing workforce development and outreach to small and medium-sized manufacturers.

I thank Representative STEVENS and Representative BALDERSON for introducing this legislation and for their work in ushering it through the Science Committee on a bipartisan basis. I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation.

I would note to my colleague that I have no other speakers so, as I reserve my time, when the gentlewoman is prepared, I will close.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. STEVENS).

Ms. STEVENS. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to have been joined by my colleagues to introduce H.R. 2397, the American Manufacturing Leadership Act. I thank Chairwoman JOHNSON,

Ranking Member LUCAS, Representatives BALDERSON and GONZALEZ, and the sponsors of the original Revitalize American Manufacturing Innovation Act, Representatives KENNEDY and REED, for their partnership in leading this legislation and for being such great champions for advanced manufacturing.

Today is a great day. It is a great legislative day and a great day for American manufacturing, for innovation, for our workforce, and for the effective utilization of our Federal Government to advance, grow, and compete.

Today, the American Manufacturing Leadership Act reauthorizes the Manufacturing USA program through bipartisan support and the willpower of our Federal Government.

What began in Youngstown, Ohio, as a pilot initiative, the vision of a lab that would usher in 3D printing applications, workforce training programs, and the transfer of new technologies across the country and into the supply chain, is now one of the 14 institutes encompassing various research concentrations. Those include Lightweight Innovations for Tomorrow Institute located in Detroit; REMADE Institute in Rochester, New York; Digital Manufacturing Institute in Chicago; and PowerAmerica in North Carolina for battery technology.

This work is in my blood, and it is part of why I came to Congress. It is also imperative for our role in global competition and for the investment in industrial policy and strategy vis-a-vis sound economic policy.

We will ensure that Manufacturing USA can continue to contribute to the growth of our domestic advanced manufacturing base and an advanced manufacturing workforce to fill the high-skilled jobs of the future.

AMLA authorizes agencies to renew their institutes for an additional period of funding following a fair review of the institutes' progress. It also strengthens the important partnership between Manufacturing USA and the Manufacturing Extension Partnership program, as well as other relevant programs across the Federal Government.

Finally, the bill authorizes funding to allow the National Institute of Standards and Technology, NIST, and the Department of Energy to continue funding their current institutes and stand up at least one additional institute in fiscal year 2020 and each year thereafter.

The real strength of these institutes lies in the consortium model, with the private partners contributing at least 50 percent of the funding.

In 2017 alone, Manufacturing USA raised almost \$180 million in investments from the private sector from nearly 1,300 manufacturers, universities, community colleges, government labs, and NGOs.

They are only able to do this because the Federal Government sets the table and provides support in the planning,

development, management, and operation of each institute.

Manufacturing USA institutes provide critical U.S. global leadership in advanced manufacturing.

□ 1430

The institutes serve as a unique collaborative platform for industry and academia to engage in best-in-class expertise to solve challenges and usher in new innovations.

The program is making, I believe, incredible strides in workforce development for the future and existing workforce. For example, in 2017, the LIFT institute in Detroit reached over 160,000 students across the country through innovative web-based curricula, as well as in-person training programs. And the Manufacturing Institute in Chicago, the digital manufacturing lab, has used a taxonomic approach to codifying job roles specific to the changing nature of advanced manufacturing brought on by the Internet of Things.

The United States will never be able to compete by bringing back the manufacturing of yesterday. We can celebrate our milestones—50 years since we landed on the Moon—as we usher in the innovations to improve the lives and outcomes of our manufacturing base for the next 50 years.

The American Manufacturing Leadership Act has already been endorsed by the Information Technology and Innovation Foundation, the American Society for Mechanical Engineers, the Bipartisan Policy Center, and the American Association of Manufacturers.

To the small and midsized manufacturers, to the suppliers, to the complex web of craftsmanship, to the future engineer, to the computer programmer, to the student dreaming in Livonia, Michigan, about what they are going to do, this one is for you.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairwoman for her extraordinary leadership on this issue for years, for the effort that she led on getting this passed in Congress several years ago, and her entire staff, the staff on both sides of the aisle when this bill was initially passed.

I also want to thank Congresswoman STEVENS for her incredible enthusiasm and dedication to workers across Michigan, across her district, but for never losing sight of what manufacturing means for this country, what this country was built on, and the men and women who make it all possible.

Mr. Speaker, a few years ago, when I introduced the Revitalize American Manufacturing and Innovation Act, it was guided by one thing: the people in my district. They were workers from Fall River to Taunton, to Milford, to Newton, who built more than just prod-

ucts on factory floors. They built entire companies; they built communities; and they built families.

Those same workers have made this legislation, this national manufacturing network, successful over the past 5 years because they have brought their ideas, their determination, and their passion and pushed our manufacturing industry forward. They have refused to leave anyone behind.

Centers like the Advanced Functional Fabrics of America, based at MIT, the research now is focused on defense and health but has consequences in a broad variety of additional innovations, has over 100 members from various States across this country pioneering new technologies that will make their way into American homes and make our soldiers and troops safer along the way.

By collaborating with local academia, especially with community colleges and vocational-technical schools, those workers are passing their skills, their expertise and experiences to a new generation of men and women who will follow in their footsteps.

As the roots of these institutes continue to expand deep into communities, from Cambridge to Youngstown to Detroit and San Jose, American workers will build new companies, stronger communities, and secure families from the abundant resources that we produce together.

Above all else, the workers who lift our economy to great heights on factory floors deserve an economy that works just as hard for them as they do for our Nation. I urge all my colleagues to support this reauthorization.

I congratulate Ms. STEVENS for work well done, and I thank the chairwoman again.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to close.

I rise again in support of H.R. 2397, the American Manufacturing Leadership Act. This bipartisan legislation takes important steps to reform the Revitalize American Manufacturing and Innovation Act of 2014.

It requires greater coordination among the centers for manufacturing innovation and incorporating GAO recommendations on the management of these centers. Most importantly, this bill prioritizes manufacturing workforce development and outreach to small- and medium-sized manufacturers.

These public-private partnerships combine the technical knowledge base supported by our excellent universities and research institutions with innovation leadership supported by our private industries, both large and small. These centers provide the U.S. with the opportunity to lead the world in advanced manufacturing competitiveness.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I simply urge all Members on both sides of the aisle to support the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JOHNSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2397, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act to make changes to the implementation of the Manufacturing USA Network, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPANDING FINDINGS FOR FEDERAL OPIOID RESEARCH AND TREATMENT ACT

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3153) to direct the Director of the National Science Foundation to support research on opioid addiction, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3153

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; FINDINGS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Expanding Findings for Federal Opioid Research and Treatment Act" or the "EFFORT Act".

(b) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) research gaps currently exist in the prevention and treatment of opioid addiction;

(2) the National Science Foundation's research on opioid addiction has increased understanding of the neuroscience of addiction, substance abuse intervention, the role of illicit supply networks, the secondary effects on families, the use of technology to address the opioid epidemic, and options for alternative, non-addictive therapeutics for pain; and

(3) the National Science Foundation and the National Institutes of Health have recognized that fundamental questions in basic, clinical, and translational research would benefit greatly from multidisciplinary approaches and collaboration.

SEC. 2. NSF SUPPORT OF RESEARCH ON OPIOID ADDICTION.

The Director of the National Science Foundation, in consultation with the Director of the National Institutes of Health, shall support merit-reviewed and competitively awarded research on the science of opioid addiction.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JOHNSON) and the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to

include extraneous material on H.R. 3153, the bill now under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 3153, the EFFORT Act.

The effect of the opioid epidemic on communities across our country is clear. Research from the CDC shows that, on average, 130 Americans die every day after overdosing on illegal opioids. In 2017, approximately 1.7 million Americans had a substance abuse disorder related to opioids. Those statistics are staggering, and the effects of this problem on our communities is heartbreaking.

While past and ongoing research conducted by the National Science Foundation has greatly increased our knowledge of opioid addiction, more work, of course, is needed. The basic research authorized in H.R. 3153 will extend and expand our understanding of opioid addiction and its impact on our communities and allow us to develop more effective evidence-based policies to address this epidemic.

I commend my colleagues, Representative WEXTON and Representative BAIRD, for their leadership on this good, bipartisan legislation and urge my colleagues to support it, and I reserve the balance of my time

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 3153, the Expanding Findings for Federal Opioid Research and Treatment, or EFFORT, Act identifies gaps that exist in research of the prevention and treatment of opioid addiction and authorizes the National Science Foundation to support research grants in these areas.

This legislation will help drive research to understand one of the most important issues facing our country: How do we stop the opioid addiction crisis?

Congress must do all we can to combat opioid abuse and the continuing increase in opioid-related deaths.

In 2017, more than 70,000 people died from drug overdoses, and approximately 68 percent of those deaths involved opioids. With my home State of Oklahoma being one of the leading States in opioid prescriptions, I believe supporting programs intended to improve our understanding of the science of addiction and combat this crisis is just common sense.

I thank Representative JENNIFER WEXTON and Representative JIM BAIRD for their bipartisan work on this bill. Opioid addiction affects too many in our communities, and I applaud this effort to support more basic research in the science of addiction.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all the Members of this body to support this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. WEXTON).

Ms. WEXTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairwoman for yielding and for her leadership on the very fine bills we have before the House here this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of my bill, H.R. 3153, the bipartisan EFFORT Act, which would expand Federal research on opioid addiction.

Since 2011, more than 200 people in the northern Shenandoah Valley of Virginia have lost their lives due to an opioid overdose. Some of the highest numbers of children being born in Virginia with neonatal abstinence syndrome have been from my district.

But these numbers don't tell the heartbreaking devastation the opioid crisis has wrought for families who have lost their mother, their father, their brother, their sister, or their child. Meanwhile, our law enforcement officers and first responders are struggling with the trauma and burnout that comes from being on the front lines of so many tragic and needless deaths of their friends and neighbors.

Tens of thousands of Americans and more than 1,000 Virginians are dying every year from overdoses. Addiction is an illness, and fighting the crisis effectively requires adequate research and funding. The EFFORT Act will help to do this by directing the National Science Foundation to support research on the science of opioid addiction.

The NSF has done an exceptional job in establishing some of the foundational understanding on opioid addiction, including research regarding the use of technology to address the crisis, the secondary effects on families, and options for alternative therapeutics for pain. And while this research has significantly increased our understanding of addiction, research gaps remain in a wide range of disciplines, including, for example, social and behavioral issues such as stigma, socioeconomic status, or treatment accessibility.

The NSF has a unique ability to help us close some of these gaps and, in turn, to help us develop solutions. By expanding the NSF's research on opioid addiction both within the agency, as well as jointly with the National Institutes of Health when needed, we can more effectively integrate clinical and basic research, obtain a broader understanding of the science of opioid addiction and its impact, and have a more comprehensive approach to tackling the crisis.

As a founding member of the bipartisan Freshmen Working Group on Addiction, I have worked to be a strong advocate for addiction prevention and recovery efforts, and I am pleased to have introduced this legislation with my fellow freshman colleague from Indiana, Dr. BAIRD. I thank him for his leadership on this issue, as well.

I urge my colleagues to support this important bipartisan legislation.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BAIRD).

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3153, the Expanding Findings for Federal Opioid Research and Treatment Act, also known as the EFFORT Act.

The opioid crisis has, tragically, destroyed the lives of many Hoosiers. According to the most recent available data from the National Institute on Drug Abuse, in 2017, drug overdose deaths in Indiana increased by 22½ percent from the previous year. Indiana's 2017 rate of overdose deaths at over 29 per 100,000 was significantly higher than the national average.

This epidemic does not discriminate, and we must use evidence-based policy to ensure the health and well-being of current and future generations. The National Science Foundation's research has increased what we know about addiction, and while this research is at the top of its class, gaps still remain in the prevention and treatment of opioid addiction.

□ 1445

That is why I joined my colleague, Congresswoman WEXTON, to introduce the EFFORT Act, directing the National Science Foundation, in consultation with the National Institutes of Health, to support merit-reviewed and competitively awarded research on the science of opioid addiction.

By expanding basic research, we can promote collaboration and further understand how to better treat the multiple aspects of the opioid addiction.

I hope we can see an end to this crisis soon, and I am proud that Congress is taking action to fight back.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. STEVENS).

Ms. STEVENS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3153, the EFFORT Act.

The opioid epidemic is one of the deadliest public health emergencies of our time, and it affects not just those addicted to opioids, but everyone around them as well.

The numbers describing this epidemic are truly staggering. According to the CDC, between 1999 and 2017, almost 400,000 Americans died from an opioid-related overdose. These statistics have worsened over time, with the CDC reporting that the number of Americans who died as the result of an opioid-involved overdose in 2017 was six times higher than the number who died in 1999.

My home State of Michigan has been hard-hit by this epidemic. Between 2016 and 2017, drug overdose deaths in Michigan increased by almost 14 percent, but it was not the only State suffering in this way.

In the same timeframe, 23 States, including Michigan, had a significant in-

crease in the rate of deaths from a drug overdose.

It is long past time that we invest in significant resources in combating the opioid epidemic.

As chairwoman of the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee's Subcommittee on Research and Technology, I have seen firsthand the excellent work done by the National Science Foundation. Their previous work on addiction and opioids have resulted in critical insights into not only the psychological process of addiction, but the social impacts of addiction as well.

Despite the progress made by the National Science Foundation, there is no doubt that further work is essential to combat the opioid epidemic.

H.R. 3153 will take advantage of the NSF's strength in basic research across many disciplines, from neuroscience to social science, in collaboration with the expertise of the National Institutes of Health in public health.

The research authorized in this bill will allow us to develop a more focused and effective policy to address the opioid epidemic.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my colleagues, Representative WEXTON and Representative BAIRD, both of whom I have the privilege of working with on the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, for their excellent leadership on this bipartisan bill, and I urge all of my colleagues to join us in passing it.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I might consume. I have no additional speakers.

I rise again in support of H.R. 3153, the EFFORT Act.

Opioid addiction knows no economic or political boundaries. It affects all of us.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Representative WEXTON and Representative BAIRD for their bipartisan leadership on this bill. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for speeches. I would like to close at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I would first like to thank all of the members of this committee on both sides of the aisle and wish to recommend that we pass the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JOHNSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3153.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMBATING SEXUAL HARASSMENT IN SCIENCE ACT OF 2019

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass

the bill (H.R. 36) to provide for research to better understand the causes and consequences of sexual harassment affecting individuals in the scientific, technical, engineering, and mathematics workforce and to examine policies to reduce the prevalence and negative impact of such harassment, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 36

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) *SHORT TITLE.*—This Act may be cited as the “Combating Sexual Harassment in Science Act of 2019”.

(b) *TABLE OF CONTENTS.*—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. Findings.

Sec. 3. Definitions.

Sec. 4. Research grants.

Sec. 5. Data collection.

Sec. 6. Responsible conduct guide.

Sec. 7. Interagency working group.

Sec. 8. National academies assessment.

Sec. 9. Authorization of appropriations.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) According to the report issued by the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine in 2018 entitled “Sexual Harassment of Women: Climate, Culture, and Consequences in Academic Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine”—

(A) sexual harassment is pervasive in institutions of higher education;

(B) the most common type of sexual harassment is gender harassment, which includes verbal and nonverbal behaviors that convey insulting, hostile, and degrading attitudes about members of one gender;

(C) 58 percent of individuals in the academic workplace experience sexual harassment, the second highest rate when compared to the military, the private sector, and Federal, State, and local government;

(D) women who are members of racial or ethnic minority groups are more likely to experience sexual harassment and to feel unsafe at work than White women, White men, or men who are members of such groups;

(E) the training for each individual who has a doctor of philosophy in the science, technology, engineering, and mathematics fields is estimated to cost approximately \$500,000; and

(F) attrition of an individual so trained results in a loss of talent and money.

(2) Sexual harassment undermines career advancement for women.

(3) According to a 2017 University of Illinois study, among astronomers and planetary scientists, 18 percent of women who are members of racial or ethnic minority groups and 12 percent of White women skipped professional events because they did not feel safe attending.

(4) Many women report leaving employment at institutions of higher education due to sexual harassment.

(5) Research shows the majority of individuals do not formally report experiences of sexual harassment due to a justified fear of retaliation or other negative professional or personal consequences.

(6) Reporting procedures with respect to such harassment are inconsistent among Federal science agencies and have varying degrees of accessibility.

(7) There is not adequate communication among Federal science agencies and between such agencies and grantees regarding reports of sexual harassment, which has resulted in harassers receiving Federal funding after moving to a different institution.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **ACADEMIES.**—The term “Academies” means the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine.

(2) **DIRECTOR.**—The term “Director” means the Director of the National Science Foundation.

(3) **FEDERAL SCIENCE AGENCY.**—The term “Federal science agency” means any Federal agency with an annual extramural research expenditure of over \$100,000,000.

(4) **FINDING OR DETERMINATION.**—The term “finding or determination” means the final disposition of a matter involving a violation of organizational policies and processes, to include the exhaustion of permissible appeals, or a conviction of a sexual offense in a criminal court of law.

(5) **GENDER HARASSMENT.**—The term “gender harassment” means verbal and nonverbal behaviors that convey hostility, objectification, exclusion, or second-class status about one’s gender, gender identity, gender presentation, sexual orientation, or pregnancy status.

(6) **GRANTEE.**—The term “grantee” means the legal entity to which a grant is awarded and that is accountable to the Federal Government for the use of the funds provided.

(7) **GRANT PERSONNEL.**—The term “grant personnel” means principal investigators, co-principal investigators, postdoctoral researchers and other employees supported by a grant award, cooperative agreement, or contract under Federal law.

(8) **INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.**—The term “institution of higher education” has the meaning given such term in section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001).

(9) **SEXUAL HARASSMENT.**—The term “sexual harassment” means conduct that encompasses—

(A) unwelcome sexual advances;

(B) unwanted physical contact that is sexual in nature, including assault;

(C) unwanted sexual attention, including sexual comments and propositions for sexual activity;

(D) conditioning professional or educational benefits on sexual activity; and

(E) retaliation for rejecting unwanted sexual attention.

(10) **STEM.**—The term “STEM” means science, technology, engineering, and mathematics, including computer science.

SEC. 4. RESEARCH GRANTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director shall establish a program to award grants, on a competitive basis, to institutions of higher education or nonprofit organizations (or consortia of such institutions or organizations)—

(1) to expand research efforts to better understand the factors contributing to, and consequences of, sexual harassment and gender harassment affecting individuals in the STEM workforce, including students and trainees; and

(2) to examine interventions to reduce the incidence and negative consequences of such harassment.

(b) **USE OF FUNDS.**—Activities funded by a grant under this section may include—

(1) research on the sexual harassment and gender harassment experiences of individuals in underrepresented or vulnerable groups, including racial and ethnic minority groups, disabled individuals, foreign nationals, sexual- and gender-minority individuals, and others;

(2) development and assessment of policies, procedures, trainings, and interventions, with respect to sexual harassment and gender harassment, conflict management, and ways to foster respectful and inclusive climates;

(3) research on approaches for remediating the negative impacts and outcomes of such harassment on individuals experiencing such harassment;

(4) support for institutions of higher education to develop, adapt, and assess the impact

of innovative, evidence-based strategies, policies, and approaches to policy implementation to prevent and address sexual harassment and gender harassment;

(5) research on alternatives to the hierarchical and dependent relationships, including but not limited to the mentor-mentee relationship, in academia that have been shown to create higher levels of risk for sexual harassment and gender harassment; and

(6) establishing a center for the ongoing compilation, management, and analysis of campus climate survey data.

SEC. 5. DATA COLLECTION.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director shall convene a working group composed of representatives of Federal statistical agencies—

(1) to develop questions on sexual harassment and gender harassment in STEM departments to gather national data on the prevalence, nature, and implications of sexual harassment and gender harassment in institutions of higher education; and

(2) to include such questions as appropriate, with sufficient protections of the privacy of respondents, in relevant surveys conducted by the National Center for Science and Engineering Statistics and other relevant entities.

SEC. 6. RESPONSIBLE CONDUCT GUIDE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director shall enter into an agreement with the Academies to update the report entitled “On Being a Scientist: A Guide to Responsible Conduct in Research” issued by the Academies. The report, as so updated, shall include—

(1) updated professional standards of conduct in research;

(2) standards of treatment individuals can expect to receive under such updated standards of conduct;

(3) evidence-based practices for fostering a climate intolerant of sexual harassment and gender harassment;

(4) methods, including bystander intervention, for identifying and addressing incidents of sexual harassment and gender harassment; and

(5) professional standards for mentorship and teaching with an emphasis on preventing sexual harassment and gender harassment.

(b) **RECOMMENDATIONS.**—In updating the report under subsection (a), the Academies shall take into account recommendations made in the report issued by the Academies in 2018 entitled “Sexual Harassment of Women: Climate, Culture, and Consequences in Academic Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine” and other relevant studies and evidence.

(c) **REPORT.**—Not later than 18 months after the effective date of the contract under subsection (a), the Academies, as part of such agreement, shall submit to the Director and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate the report referred to in such subsection, as updated pursuant to such subsection.

SEC. 7. INTERAGENCY WORKING GROUP.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, acting through the National Science and Technology Council, shall establish an interagency working group for the purpose of coordinating Federal science agency efforts to reduce the prevalence of sexual harassment and gender harassment involving grant personnel. The working group shall be chaired by the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy (or the Director’s designee) and shall include a representative from each Federal science agency with annual extramural research expenditures totaling over \$1,000,000,000, a representative from the Department of Education, and a representative from the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

(b) **RESPONSIBILITIES OF WORKING GROUP.**—The interagency working group established

under subsection (a) shall coordinate Federal science agency efforts to implement the policy guidelines developed under subsection (c)(2).

(c) **RESPONSIBILITIES OF OSTP.**—The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall—

(1) not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, submit to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate an inventory of policies, procedures, and resources dedicated to preventing and responding to reports of sexual harassment and gender harassment at Federal agencies that provide legal definitions to which institutions of higher education must comply; and

(2) not later than 6 months after the date on which the inventory is submitted under paragraph (1)—

(A) in consultation with outside stakeholders and Federal science agencies, develop a uniform set of policy guidelines for Federal science agencies; and

(B) submit a report to the committees referred to in paragraph (1) containing such guidelines;

(3) encourage and monitor efforts of Federal science agencies to develop or maintain and implement policies based on the guidelines developed under paragraph (2), including the extent to which Federal science agency policies depart from the uniform policy guidelines;

(4) not later than 1 year after the date on which the inventory under paragraph (1) is submitted, and every 5 years thereafter, the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall report to Congress on the implementation by Federal science agencies of the policy guidelines developed under paragraph (2); and

(5) update such policy guidelines as needed.

(d) **REQUIREMENTS.**—In developing policy guidelines under subsection (c)(2), the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall include guidelines that require—

(1) grantees to submit to the Federal science agency or agencies from which the grantees receive funding reports relating to—

(A) administrative action, related to an allegation against grant personnel of any sexual harassment or gender harassment, as set forth in organizational policies or codes of conduct, statutes, regulations, or executive orders, that affects the ability of grant personnel or their trainees to carry out the activities of the grant; and

(B) findings or determinations against grant personnel of sexual harassment or gender harassment, as set forth in organizational policies or codes of conduct, statutes, regulations, or executive orders, including any findings or determinations related to reports submitted under subparagraph (A) and any disciplinary action that was taken;

(2) the sharing, updating, and archiving of reports of sexual harassment and gender harassment from grantees submitted under paragraph (1)(B) with relevant Federal science agencies on a quarterly basis; and

(3) to the extent practicable, ensure consistency among Federal agencies with regards to the policies and procedures for receiving reports submitted pursuant to paragraph (1), which may include the designation of a single agency to field reports so submitted.

(e) **CONSIDERATIONS.**—In developing policy guidelines under subsection (c)(2), the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall consider guidelines that require or incentivize—

(1) grantees to periodically assess their organizational climate, which may include the use of climate surveys, focus groups, or exit interviews;

(2) grantees to publish on a publicly available internet website the results of assessments conducted pursuant to paragraph (1), disaggregated by gender and, if possible, race, ethnicity, disability status, and sexual orientation;

(3) grantees to make public on an annual basis the number of reports of sexual harassment and gender harassment at each such institution;

(4) grantees to regularly assess and improve policies, procedures, and interventions to reduce the prevalence of sexual harassment and gender harassment;

(5) each grantee to demonstrate in its proposal for a grant award, cooperative agreement, or contract that a code of conduct is in place for maintaining a healthy and welcoming workplace for grant personnel and their trainees;

(6) the diffusion of the hierarchical and dependent relationships between grant personnel and their trainees;

(7) each grantee and Federal science agency to have in place mechanisms for the re-integration of individuals who have experienced sexual harassment and gender harassment; and

(8) grantees to work to create a climate intolerant of sexual harassment and gender harassment.

(f) **FEDERAL SCIENCE AGENCY IMPLEMENTATION.**—Each Federal science agency shall—

(1) develop or maintain and implement policies with respect to sexual harassment and gender harassment that are consistent with policy guidelines under subsection (c)(2) and that protect the privacy of all parties involved in any report and investigation of sexual harassment and gender harassment, except to the extent necessary to carry out an investigation; and

(2) broadly disseminate such policies to current and potential recipients of research grants, cooperative agreements, or contracts awarded by such agency.

(g) **FERPA.**—The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall ensure that such guidelines and requirements are consistent with the requirements of section 444 of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1232g) (commonly referred to as the “Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974”).

(h) **SUNSET.**—The interagency working group established under subsection (a) shall terminate on the date that is 7 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 8. NATIONAL ACADEMIES ASSESSMENT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director shall enter into an agreement with the Academies to undertake a study of the influence of sexual harassment and gender harassment in institutions of higher education on the career advancement of individuals in the STEM workforce. The study shall assess—

(1) the state of research on sexual harassment and gender harassment in such workforce;

(2) whether research demonstrates a change in the prevalence of sexual harassment and gender harassment in such workforce;

(3) the progress made with respect to implementing recommendations promulgated in the Academies consensus study report entitled “Sexual Harassment of Women: Climate, Culture, and Consequences in Academic Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine”; and

(4) where to focus future efforts with respect to decreasing sexual harassment and gender harassment in such institutions.

SEC. 9. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There is authorized to be appropriated to the Director to carry out this Act, \$17,500,000.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JOHNSON) and the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to re-

vising and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on H.R. 36, the bill that is now under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of H.R. 36, the Combating Sexual Harassment in Science Act.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my good friend, Ranking Member Mr. LUCAS, for joining me in introducing this bill and for his commitment to expanding access to STEM studies and careers.

This bill is a product of more than a year of activity by the Science, Space, and Technology Committee. We heard from many experts about the prevalence of sexual harassment in STEM, what factors have enabled it, the impact it has on the lives and careers of so many talented young scientists and engineers, and the loss to our Nation when they leave research altogether.

We also learned of some best practices for universities, scientific societies, and Federal agencies to begin to bring transparency and accountability to this challenge.

Federal science agencies have an important role to play, because they have the responsibility to ensure that all federally-funded researchers, including students, are able to carry out their research in safe environments at all times.

However, agencies need universities to be partners in that area and effort, and that partnership starts with universities reporting to their funders when a student or researcher is brave enough to come forward with an allegation of sexual harassment.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud the National Science Foundation for its bold leadership in implementing a reporting policy, and NIH and NASA for their own more recent efforts. Unfortunately, other agencies have been slow to respond.

H.R. 36 directs the Office of Science and Technology Policy to issue uniform guidance to all Federal science agencies to implement reporting requirements for all grantees.

We worked closely with the university community to define the circumstances that should trigger a report. Not everybody was happy with the result, but it was a good compromise, and protects the most vulnerable.

Also, it is important to note that this bill does not interfere with due process. It simply requires transparency while protecting privacy.

H.R. 36 also supports research to inform updated policies in the future, it seeks to incentivize culture change at universities, and it makes clear that sexual harassment should now be considered as important as research mis-

conduct, as recommended by the National Academies.

While sexual harassment in science is not a problem that can be solved with legislation alone, H.R. 36 helps ensure that the Federal agencies are doing their part. No researcher should be forced to choose between her passion for science and her right to feel safe.

This legislation has broad support and has been endorsed by 28 scientific and scholarly organizations.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this bipartisan bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 36, the Combating Sexual Harassment in Science Act of 2019. I am proud to say that this bill is a foundation of more than a year of investigation, analysis, and recommendations to the Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

Curbing sexual misconduct in science is a priority that Chairwoman JOHNSON and I share.

Engaging more women in STEM studies and careers is essential to American competitiveness. Women make up half the workforce, but account for less than 25 percent of America's STEM workforce.

Unfortunately, too many women have been driven out of STEM careers due to a culture of harassment and abuse.

H.R. 36 takes the first steps to address this problem. The bill directs the NSF to expand research efforts to better understand the causes and consequences of sexual harassment affecting individuals in the scientific, technical, engineering, and mathematics workforce.

Additionally, it directs the NSF to examine policies to reduce the prevalence and negative impact of such harassment.

The bill also supports the adoption of uniform guidance across the Federal science agencies to reduce the prevalence of sexual harassment involving grant personnel.

There is an established legal process in place within higher education and in the workplace for handling claims of sexual harassment. I cannot stress this enough: This bill does not alter that process.

What this bill does is to create a uniform policy for universities and research institutions to report to Federal science agencies when administrative action is taken that impacts the ability of a researcher to carry out a grant.

Pervasive sexual harassment in the scientific community discourages women from critical work in good-paying jobs and hurts American competitiveness.

It is unacceptable for taxpayer dollars to fund researchers who are guilty of harassing students or colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the stakeholders, especially the university community, for working with the committee staff to improve this legislation. I believe the revised bill strikes

the right balance of protecting due process and privacy, while making sure that Federal science agencies can act if a Federal research grant or the personnel supported by that grant is impacted.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairwoman JOHNSON and her staff for working in a bipartisan and collaborative way to move this legislation forward.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation.

H.R. 36 takes the first steps towards addressing the prevalence of sexual harassment in STEM fields, which is driving women out of STEM careers and damaging U.S. competitiveness.

This legislation sends a strong message to the scientific community that misconduct will not be tolerated, and it sends a message to women who are in STEM studies and careers that we support them.

I look forward to working with our colleagues in the Senate and stakeholders to advance this legislation and make sure it is meeting the intended goals.

Mr. Speaker, I again want to thank Chairwoman JOHNSON and her staff for working in a bipartisan and collaborative way on this legislation. I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this bipartisan bill. I thank members of the full committee for their work on this bill, I recommend passage, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JOHNSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 36, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VERA C. RUBIN OBSERVATORY DESIGNATION ACT

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3196) to designate the Large Synoptic Survey Telescope as the “Vera Rubin Survey Telescope”, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3196

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Vera C. Rubin Observatory Designation Act”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Dr. Vera Rubin was born July 23, 1928, to Philip and Rose Applebaum Cooper.

(2) Dr. Rubin pursued her graduate studies at Cornell University and Georgetown University, earning her Ph.D. in Physics in 1954.

(3) Dr. Rubin’s Ph.D. thesis on galaxy motions provided supporting evidence that galaxies are not uniformly distributed, but exist in clusters.

(4) Dr. Rubin continued to study the motions of galaxies, first as research associate and assistant professor at Georgetown University, and then as a member of the staff at the Carnegie Institution of Washington Department of Terrestrial Magnetism.

(5) Dr. Rubin faced barriers throughout her career because of her gender.

(6) For instance, one of the world’s leading astronomy facilities at the time, the Palomar Observatory, did not permit women. Dr. Rubin persisted and was finally allowed to observe at Palomar in 1965, the first woman officially allowed to do so.

(7) In 1970, Dr. Rubin published measurements of the Andromeda galaxy showing stars and gas orbiting the galaxy’s center too fast to be explained by the amount of mass associated with the light output of the stars.

(8) In the years that followed, Dr. Rubin and her collaborators used their observations, in conjunction with the work by earlier astronomers on the rotation of stars in spiral galaxies, to provide some of the best evidence for the existence of dark matter.

(9) This work contributed to a major shift in the conventional view of the universe, from one dominated by ordinary matter such as what produces the light of stars, to one dominated by dark matter.

(10) Dr. Rubin was elected to the National Academy of Sciences in 1981, the second woman astronomer to be so honored.

(11) Dr. Rubin was awarded the President’s National Medal of Science in 1993 “for her pioneering research programs in observational cosmology which demonstrated that much of the matter in the universe is dark, and for significant contributions to the realization that the universe is more complex and more mysterious than had been imagined”.

(12) Dr. Rubin was an outspoken advocate for the equal treatment and representation of women in science, and she served as a mentor, supporter, and role model to many women astronomers throughout her life.

(13) The Large Synoptic Survey Telescope, funded jointly by the National Science Foundation and the Department of Energy, will honor the legacy of Dr. Rubin and her colleagues to probe the nature of dark matter by mapping and cataloging billions of galaxies through space and time.

SEC. 3. DESIGNATION.

The Large Synoptic Survey Telescope shall be known and designated as the “Vera C. Rubin Observatory”.

SEC. 4. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility described in section 3 shall be deemed to be a reference to the “Vera C. Rubin Observatory”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JOHNSON) and the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

□ 1500

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 3196, the bill now under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3196, which, after today’s consideration, will be known as the Vera C. Rubin Observatory Designation Act.

I thank Representative GONZALEZ-COLÓN for joining me in introducing this bill.

Dr. Vera Rubin was a trailblazing astronomer, who dedicated her life to advancing our understanding of the cosmos. She was also a tireless advocate for women in science, and she was well known for her mentorship of aspiring women astronomers. Today would have been Dr. Rubin’s 91st birthday, but, sadly, she passed away on Christmas Day in 2016.

During the 1970s, Dr. Rubin published the best set of measurements of the galaxy rotation to date. Her data revealed something surprising. The stars orbiting in the outer regions of the galaxies were moving much faster than expected. Dark matter, first proposed decades prior, was the only way to explain the observed motion.

Dr. Rubin’s work helped to convince the broader astronomy community of the existence of dark matter and revolutionized the way we understand the universe. Instead of being dominated by light-emitting matter, Dr. Rubin’s work revealed that most of the universe is made up of a mysterious and invisible substance called dark matter.

The Large Synoptic Survey Telescope, or LSST, is an 8.4-meter telescope currently under construction in Chile. Funded jointly by the National Science Foundation and the Department of Energy, LSST will conduct an unprecedented survey of the night sky. The data collected by this telescope will enable scientists to build on Dr. Rubin’s pioneering work and probe the nature of dark matter.

Dr. Rubin’s exemplary science and her sterling character will drive scientific discovery and inspire girls and women in STEM for decades to come. While Dr. Rubin has already claimed a well-deserved place in history, H.R. 3196 will further elevate her story by designating one of the world’s preeminent research facilities as the Vera C. Rubin Observatory.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3196, the Vera C. Rubin Observatory Designation Act. This bill honors the contributions of the late Dr. Vera Rubin, an astronomer who made groundbreaking discoveries in the field of dark matter and contributed to the realization that the universe is more complex and more mysterious than was ever even imagined.

I agree with Chairwoman JOHNSON that it is fitting that the House honor Dr. Rubin today on what would have been her 91st birthday. Dr. Rubin was a pioneer and lifelong advocate for women in science, serving as a mentor, supporter, and role model for many women astronomers.

The new Large Synoptic Survey Telescope under construction in Chile, funded by the National Science Foundation and the Department of Energy, will photograph the entire sky every few nights. One of the goals of the project is to study the nature of dark matter and dark energy.

I thank Chairwoman JOHNSON and Representative GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN for their leadership and for working with stakeholders to update this legislation.

Naming the observatory in honor of Dr. Rubin is a fitting tribute to her contributions to the field, and I hope it will inspire future generations of women in astronomy. This bill designates the new NSF and Department of Energy's LSST telescope facility the Vera C. Rubin Observatory. Given her remarkable contributions to the field of dark matter and advocacy for the equal treatment and representation of women in science, it is only appropriate that we honor Dr. Rubin this way.

I thank Chairwoman JOHNSON and Representative GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN for their leadership in introducing this bill. It is my hope that this will ensure that Dr. Rubin's legacy lives on and continues to inspire young women to pursue careers in STEM.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Mr. Speaker, I also thank Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN for cosponsoring this bill, and I thank the full committee for supporting it. I urge its passage, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3196, the Vera C. Rubin Observatory Designation Act, of which I am the co-lead alongside Chairwoman JOHNSON.

Dr. Rubin exemplified perseverance and tenacity in science. As a woman scientist, she encountered many obstacles during her academic and professional career. As a student, her application to Princeton University was denied because, at the time, women were not allowed to enroll in the astrophysics graduate program of this institution. Similarly, years later, she had problems accessing the Palomar Observatory in California, one of the most iconic scientific facilities in the world, also because she was a woman. Experiences such as these would be enough to discourage a young student and scientist. Still, Dr. Rubin persevered, demonstrating exceptional intellectual capabilities and character.

Dr. Vera Rubin changed the way we understand the universe. Her groundbreaking work on dark matter and galaxy rotations remain at the forefront of STEM research in the field of astronomy. Her legacy will undoubtedly con-

tinue to influence future generations of scientists and will hopefully be memorialized in the new Large Synoptic Survey Telescope (LSST) Observatory under construction in Chile. I am very much looking forward to the great work this facility will produce by researchers, like Dr. Rubin.

I am immensely proud of this bill. Especially to be speaking about it today, July 23rd, on what would have been Dr. Rubin's 91st birthday.

I believe highlighting the sacrifices and contributions women have made to the sciences is one of the many ways we can continue to foster their participation in STEM fields. Like multiple minorities, women face their own subset of challenges that hinder their decision to pursue or remain in STEM careers. This has a negative impact on the development and advancement of women in general, and in our economy by not capitalizing from the remarkable talent of women in STEM.

I would like to thank Chairwoman JOHNSON and Ranking Member LUCAS for their leadership and for moving this bill through Committee. As someone with a STEM background, and as a representative of many young girls and women who are either pursuing or interested in pursuing a career in STEM—I look forward to working with my colleagues to get this bill signed into law. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JOHNSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3196, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to designate the Large Synoptic Survey Telescope as the 'Vera C. Rubin Observatory'."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ENERGY AND WATER RESEARCH INTEGRATION ACT OF 2019

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 34) to ensure consideration of water intensity in the Department of Energy's energy research, development, and demonstration programs to help guarantee efficient, reliable, and sustainable delivery of energy and clean water resources, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 34

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Energy and Water Research Integration Act of 2019".

SEC. 2. INTEGRATING ENERGY AND WATER RESEARCH.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Energy shall integrate water considerations into energy research, development, and demonstration programs and projects of the Department of Energy by—

(1) advancing energy and energy efficiency technologies and practices that meet the objectives of—

(A) minimizing freshwater withdrawal and consumption;

(B) increasing water use efficiency;

(C) utilizing nontraditional water sources with efforts to improve the quality of the water from those sources;

(D) minimizing deleterious impacts on water bodies, groundwater, and waterways; and

(E) minimizing seismic impacts;

(2) considering the effects climate variability may have on water supplies and quality for energy generation and fuel production; and

(3) improving understanding of the energy-water nexus.

(b) STRATEGIC PLAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 12 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall develop a strategic plan identifying the research, development, and demonstration needs for Department programs and projects to carry out subsection (a). The strategic plan shall include technical milestones for achieving and assessing progress toward the objectives of subsection (a)(1).

(2) SPECIFIC CONSIDERATIONS.—In developing the strategic plan, the Secretary shall consider—

(A) new advanced cooling technologies for energy generation and fuel production technologies;

(B) performance improvement of existing cooling technologies and cost reductions associated with using those technologies;

(C) innovative water reuse, recovery, and treatment technologies in energy generation and fuel production, including renewable energy;

(D) technology development for carbon capture and storage systems that utilize efficient water use design strategies;

(E) technologies that are life-cycle cost effective;

(F) systems analysis and modeling of issues relating to the energy-water nexus;

(G) technologies to treat and utilize wastewater and produced waters discharged from oil, natural gas, coalbed methane, and any other substance to be used as an energy source;

(H) advanced materials for the use of nontraditional water sources for energy generation and fuel production;

(I) biomass production and utilization and the impact on hydrologic systems;

(J) technologies that reduce impacts on water from energy resource development;

(K) energy efficient technologies for water distribution, treatment, supply, and collection systems;

(L) technologies for energy generation from water distribution, treatment, supply, and collection systems;

(M) the flexible operation of water infrastructure to provide essential grid reliability services;

(N) modular or energy-water microgrid systems that can provide energy and water resources in remote or disaster recovery areas;

(O) recovering energy in the form of biofuels, bioproducts, and biopower from municipal and industrial wastewaters, and similar organic streams; and

(P) any other area of the energy-water nexus that the Secretary considers appropriate.

(3) COLLABORATION AND NONDUPLICATION.—In developing the strategic plan, the Secretary shall coordinate and avoid duplication—

(A) with other Federal agencies operating related programs, if appropriate; and

(B) across programs and projects of the Department, including with those of the National Laboratories.

(4) **RELEVANT INFORMATION AND RECOMMENDATIONS.**—In developing the strategic plan, the Secretary shall consider and incorporate, as appropriate, relevant information and recommendations, including those of the National Water Availability and Use Assessment Program under section 9508(d) of the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (42 U.S.C. 10368(d)).

(5) **ADDITIONAL PARTICIPATION.**—In developing the strategic plan, the Secretary shall consult and coordinate with a diverse group of representatives from research and academic institutions, industry, public utility commissions, and State and local governments who have expertise in technologies and practices relating to the energy-water nexus.

(6) **SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 12 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate the strategic plan.

(7) **UPDATING THE STRATEGIC PLAN.**—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, and at least once every 5 years thereafter, the Secretary shall—

(A) utilize relevant information produced by Federal Government agencies, academia, State, local, and tribal governments and industry to update the strategic plan;

(B) include in the updated strategic plan a description of the changes from the previous strategic plan and the rationale for such changes;

(C) include a review of progress made towards the milestones outlined in the previous strategic plan; and

(D) submit the updated strategic plan to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate.

(C) **ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES.**—The Secretary may provide for such additional research, development, and demonstration activities as appropriate to integrate water considerations into the research, development, and demonstration activities of the Department as described in subsection (a).

SEC. 3. ENERGY-WATER OVERSIGHT AND COORDINATION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In carrying out the research, development, and demonstration activities outlined in section 2, the Secretary, in coordination with other relevant Federal agencies, shall establish an Energy-Water Committee to promote and enable improved energy and water resource data collection, reporting, and technological innovation. The Committee shall consist of—

(1) representation from each program within the Department and each Federal agency that conducts research related to the energy-water nexus; and

(2) non-Federal members, including representatives of research and academic institutions, State, local, and tribal governments, public utility commissions, and industry, who have expertise in technologies, technological innovations, or practices relating to the energy-water nexus.

(b) **FUNCTIONS.**—The Committee shall, in carrying out section 2—

(1) make recommendations on the development and integration of data collection and data communication standards and protocols, including models and modeling results, to agencies and entities currently engaged in collecting the data for the energy-water nexus;

(2) recommend ways to make improvements to Federal water use data to increase understanding of trends in energy generation and fuel production, including non-cooling water uses;

(3) recommend best practices for utilizing information from existing monitoring networks to provide nationally uniform water and energy use and infrastructure data; and

(4) conduct annual technical workshops, including at least 1 regional workshop annually, to facilitate information exchange among Federal, regional, State, local, and tribal governments and private sector experts on technologies that encourage the conservation and efficient use of water and energy.

(c) **REPORTS.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and at least once every 2 years thereafter, the Committee, through the Secretary, shall transmit to Congress a report on its findings and activities under this section.

(d) **APPLICABILITY OF FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT.**—Except as otherwise provided in this section, the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall apply to the Committee.

SEC. 4. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, nothing in this Act shall be construed to require State, tribal, or local governments to provide additional data for Federal purposes, or to take any action that may result in an increased financial burden to such governments by restricting the use of water by such governments.

SEC. 5. COORDINATION AND NONDUPLICATION.

To the maximum extent practicable, the Secretary shall coordinate activities under this Act with other programs of the Department and other Federal research programs.

SEC. 6. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **COMMITTEE.**—The term “Committee” means the Energy-Water Committee established under section 3(a).

(2) **DEPARTMENT.**—The term “Department” means the Department of Energy.

(3) **ENERGY-WATER NEXUS.**—The term “energy-water nexus” means the energy required to provide reliable water supplies and the water required to provide reliable energy supplies throughout the United States.

(4) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Energy.

SEC. 7. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled “Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation” for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JOHNSON) and the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 34, the bill now under consideration.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 34, the Energy and Water Research Integration Act of 2019.

I first thank my friend, Mr. LUCAS, who joined me in introducing this legislation, which calls attention to the critical link between energy and water and instructs the Department of Energy to ensure due consideration of water issues in its research, development, and demonstration programs.

As we all know, especially those of us who represent Texas, Oklahoma, and other southwestern and western States, we have limited water resources that must be distributed appropriately to our large energy industries, agricultural communities, and rapidly growing populations. We have experienced crippling droughts in recent years, so it is vital that we do as much as possible to use this commodity wisely.

However, not many people are aware of the importance of water to energy generation and, similarly, the crucial role that energy plays in delivery of safe, sanitary water to our constituents.

The Energy and Water Research Integration Act encourages research into energy technologies that would improve and minimize the use of water and energy production, and also establishes a mechanism for Federal agencies to work with State and local governments and other stakeholders to advance our understanding of what is known as the “energy-water nexus.” In addition, the bill requires a regularly updated strategic plan to guide these efforts. These are important, positive steps towards using our limited resources in the most efficient and effective way possible.

I am pleased that these issues have already received serious attention so far this Congress, with the committee hosting a hearing on this bill in March and two markups, one at the subcommittee level and one before the full committee. Our hearing witnesses and other crucial stakeholders, including the Department of Energy, were able to contribute and shape the legislation to the well-vetted proposal that we are finally considering today. I hope that we can demonstrate a strong, sustained commitment to research and development in this vital area.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of this bipartisan bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to cosponsor H.R. 34, the Energy and Water Research Integration Act. This legislation is a product of bipartisan Science, Space, and Technology Committee efforts to improve our understanding of the critical relationship between the U.S. energy and water sectors.

The production of energy is dependent on reliable sources of water, and the distribution of clean water is dependent on the availability of energy. No matter what the future U.S. energy market looks like, integrating these

two systems is essential. But this is no simple task.

Both water and energy management are often impacted by many regional challenges and resources and require careful consideration of local factors. For example, back home in Oklahoma, agriculture is the single largest driver of water consumption in the State. But that same agricultural industry also creates a source of energy through biofuels.

Additionally, natural gas production, which is key to the development of a cleaner U.S. energy market, relies on horizontal drilling and hydraulic fracturing, processes which require large volumes of water. But these processes can also produce water, enabling reuse of this resource through fluid lifecycle management.

The Energy and Water Research Integration Act will help prioritize research and development on this critical relationship between energy and water systems and will help American researchers develop tools and technologies to improve our Nation's energy efficiency, environmental stability, and economic growth.

I am pleased to see the work that many Federal agencies, including the Department of Energy and the Environmental Protection Agency, are already doing to improve the efficiency of our energy water systems, and to see the administration's clear prioritization of this work, including the multiagency Water Security Grand Challenge and the recently announced DOE Energy-Water Desalination Hub. But we, in Congress, must also do our part.

Because of the complex relationship between energy and water systems, this will require a multidisciplinary approach. At every step of the R&D process there is a need to facilitate interactions between chemists, engineers, geologists, and legislators, and to encourage collaboration between the Federal Government, industry, universities, and local stakeholders.

I believe this legislation, introduced by Chairwoman JOHNSON and myself, can help to streamline and prioritize this work. The programs authorized in this legislation will leverage the world-leading, early-stage research programs and unparalleled facilities at our national labs and enable the development of next-generation technologies that will improve the efficiency and production in both the energy and water sectors.

I thank my colleagues on the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, particularly Chairwoman EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, for continuing to prioritize important research and development programs that will make America stronger, cleaner, and keep us globally competitive. I am grateful for the opportunity to continue to work with my fellow Science, Space, and Technology Committee colleagues to guide this important and bipartisan work.

□ 1515

H.R. 34 prioritizes critical research to help improve the way we use energy and water.

I again want to thank Chairwoman JOHNSON for her leadership on this bill. I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to make sure that all members of this committee and staff are thanked for their efforts, and I urge support of this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JOHNSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 34, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY VETERANS' HEALTH INITIATIVE ACT

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 617) to authorize the Department of Energy to conduct collaborative research with the Department of Veterans Affairs in order to improve healthcare services for veterans in the United States, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 617

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Department of Energy Veterans' Health Initiative Act".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) DEPARTMENT.—The term "Department" means the Department of Energy.

(2) NATIONAL LABORATORY.—The term "National Laboratory" has the meaning given that term in section 2 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15801).

(3) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Energy.

SEC. 3. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this Act are to advance Department of Energy expertise in artificial intelligence and high-performance computing in order to improve health outcomes for veteran populations by—

(1) supporting basic research through the application of artificial intelligence, high-performance computing, modeling and simulation, machine learning, and large-scale data analytics to identify and solve outcome-defined challenges in the health sciences;

(2) maximizing the impact of the Department of Veterans Affairs' health and genomics data housed at the National Laboratories, as well as data from other sources, on science, innovation, and health care outcomes through the use and advancement of artificial intelligence and high-performance computing capabilities of the Department of Energy;

(3) promoting collaborative research through the establishment of partnerships to improve data sharing between Federal agencies, National Laboratories, institutions of higher education, and nonprofit institutions;

(4) establishing multiple scientific computing user facilities to house and provision available data to foster transformational outcomes; and

(5) driving the development of technology to improve artificial intelligence, high-performance computing, and networking relevant to mission applications of the Department of Energy, including modeling, simulation, machine learning, and advanced data analytics.

SEC. 4. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY VETERANS HEALTH RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish and carry out a research program in artificial intelligence and high-performance computing, focused on the development of tools to solve big data challenges associated with veteran's healthcare, and to support the efforts of the Department of Veterans Affairs to identify potential health risks and challenges utilizing data on long-term healthcare, health risks, and genomic data collected from veteran populations. The Secretary shall carry out this program through a competitive, merit-reviewed process, and consider applications from National Laboratories, institutions of higher education, multi-institutional collaborations, and other appropriate entities.

(b) PROGRAM COMPONENTS.—In carrying out the program established under subsection (a), the Secretary may—

(1) conduct basic research in modeling and simulation, machine learning, large-scale data analytics, and predictive analysis in order to develop novel or optimized algorithms for prediction of disease treatment and recovery;

(2) develop methods to accommodate large data sets with variable quality and scale, and to provide insight and models for complex systems;

(3) develop new approaches and maximize the use of algorithms developed through artificial intelligence, machine learning, data analytics, natural language processing, modeling and simulation, and develop new algorithms suitable for high-performance computing systems and large biomedical data sets;

(4) advance existing and construct new data enclaves capable of securely storing data sets provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs, Department of Defense, and other sources; and

(5) promote collaboration and data sharing between National Laboratories, research entities, and user facilities of the Department by providing the necessary access and secure data transfer capabilities.

(c) COORDINATION.—In carrying out the program required under subsection (a), the Secretary is authorized to—

(1) enter into memoranda of understanding in order to carry out reimbursable agreements with the Department of Veterans Affairs and other entities in order to maximize the effectiveness of Department of Energy research and development to improve veterans' healthcare;

(2) consult with the Department of Veterans Affairs and other Federal agencies as appropriate; and

(3) ensure that data storage meets all privacy and security requirements established by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and that access to data is provided in accordance with relevant Department of Veterans Affairs data access policies, including informed consent.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this Act,

the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate, a report detailing the effectiveness of—

(1) the interagency coordination between each Federal agency involved in the research program carried out under this section;

(2) collaborative research achievements of the program; and

(3) potential opportunities to expand the technical capabilities of the Department.

(e) FUNDING.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out this section \$27,000,000 during the period of fiscal years 2020 through 2024.

SEC. 5. INTERAGENCY COLLABORATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized to carry out research, development, and demonstration activities to develop tools to apply to big data that enable Federal agencies, institutions of higher education, non-profit research organizations, and industry to better leverage the capabilities of the Department to solve complex, big data challenges. The Secretary shall carry out these activities through a competitive, merit-reviewed process, and consider applications from National Laboratories, institutions of higher education, multi-institutional collaborations, and other appropriate entities.

(b) ACTIVITIES.—In carrying out the research, development, and demonstration activities authorized under subsection (a), the Secretary may—

(1) utilize all available mechanisms to prevent duplication and coordinate research efforts across the Department;

(2) establish multiple user facilities to serve as data enclaves capable of securely storing data sets created by Federal agencies, institutions of higher education, non-profit organizations, or industry at National Laboratories; and

(3) promote collaboration and data sharing between National Laboratories, research entities, and user facilities of the Department by providing the necessary access and secure data transfer capabilities.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report evaluating the effectiveness of the activities authorized under subsection (a).

(d) FUNDING.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Energy to carry out subsection (a) \$15,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2020 through 2023.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JOHNSON) and the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on H.R. 617, the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 617, the Department of Energy Veterans' Health Initiative Act. This bill authorizes the Department of Energy to conduct collaborative research with the Department of Veterans Affairs to address large and complex data management challenges associated with veterans' healthcare issues.

H.R. 617 also authorizes the Department of Energy to support activities that will better enable other Federal agencies to leverage the Department's capabilities in developing advanced data analytics tools for a broad range of applications.

I would like to thank the members of the Veterans' Affairs Committee for working with us to improve this legislation. I would also like to thank the bill's sponsor, Mr. NORMAN, for his hard work on this bill.

Before I began my career in politics, I worked as a chief psychiatric nurse for the Dallas VA Medical Center in Dallas, Texas. In that position, I saw firsthand the unique healthcare needs of the veteran community. I believe the bill before us today will be a positive step toward tackling some of the critical problems that the VA is currently facing in providing our veterans with the care they deserve when they come home.

I strongly support this bipartisan bill and encourage my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Representative NORMAN's bill, H.R. 617, the Department of Energy Veterans' Health Initiative Act.

This bill authorizes a critical and ongoing partnership between the Department of Energy and the Department of Veterans Affairs to improve the way we diagnose and care for our veterans. This partnership, known as the MVP-CHAMPION initiative, allows DOE to support the VA in analyzing healthcare data.

H.R. 617 formally authorizes this program, allowing VA researchers to gain access to DOE's high-performance computing research facilities and significant resources, including DOE's extensive expertise in data analysis and complex modeling.

The VA currently collects genomic and healthcare data, including the deepest levels of DNA sequencing that allows for high-quality genomic research, from veterans who have volunteered for the program. This data is then securely transferred to DOE, where it is stored and analyzed in a secure site at DOE's Oak Ridge National Laboratory.

This partnership and exchange of data benefits both DOE and the VA. The rich and expansive dataset provided by the VA presents an incredible opportunity to train DOE's next-generation computing capacities to solve complex challenges; and with what

they learn from this analysis, the VA can improve and better target health treatments for veterans.

This data can help the VA make discoveries about the causes of various diseases and develop diagnostics to move more quickly to detect them in our veterans. It will also help the VA develop more effective treatments and improve treatment for critical medical needs.

In return, by giving DOE access to such a large database of information, the VA will help DOE researchers improve their ability to develop next-generation computing systems, algorithms, and models, capacities that are critical in maintaining U.S. science and technological leadership.

These enhanced capacities can then be applied in support of DOE's core mission areas and has the potential to enhance expertise in everything from biosciences and material designs to maintaining our nuclear weapons stockpile.

With the next generation of supercomputers right around the corner, most notably, the computing systems that DOE is expected to field in 2021, DOE will be able to tackle even bigger challenges after gaining expertise in solving big data problems like this.

In short, the Department of Energy Veterans' Health Initiative Act will improve the healthcare for those men and women who have served our country. It also maximizes our Federal resources for facilitating collaboration, and gives other agencies, academia, and industry the chance to benefit from the Department of Energy's R&D expertise.

I want to thank Representative NORMAN for championing this important collaboration, along with the basic research that will support our veterans and American innovation.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time, and I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN).

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairwoman JOHNSON and Ranking Member LUCAS for their support of this all-important bill.

I rise in support of H.R. 617, the Department of Energy Veterans' Health Initiative Act.

This legislation authorizes a partnership between the Department of Energy—the DOE—and the Department of Veterans Affairs—the VA—to conduct collaborative research in computing, artificial intelligence, and big data science in order to improve healthcare for all of our veterans.

The VA hosts one of the largest and most valuable health datasets. Through its voluntary data collection program, entitled the Million Veterans Program, MVP, the VA has collected

detailed health information and genomic data volunteered by over 600,000 veterans.

But the VA simply doesn't have the computing power or expertise to analyze all of this complex data. In order to learn from their data and provide better healthcare for veterans, the VA needs access to more advanced computing capabilities, expertise, and infrastructure than is currently available at the agency.

As a world leader in high-performance computing, the DOE is an ideal partner to help the VA meet this need. In its national laboratory system, DOE hosts 5 of the world's top 10 fastest supercomputers, including the fastest supercomputer in the world, Summit, at Oak Ridge National Laboratory.

The DOE also funds research and computational sciences and data analytics, which can be used to solve a range of complex big data challenges in the physical sciences. The interagency partnership between DOE and the VA authorized by my bill is necessary to analyze this data and ultimately provide better care for our Nation's veterans.

DOE has the capability to securely store, using supercomputers at the national labs, and analyze the VA's health data to look for patterns. Learning from these patterns can help us improve the medical treatments for heart disease, traumatic brain injury, and cancer.

I think we can all agree that we should be taking any steps possible to improve the medical care of our men and women who have answered the call to serve. Not only does this bill take that step, but it has benefit in giving our scientists the ability to analyze complex data that will help America remain the world's leader in advanced computing.

The bill also requires the DOE to establish data storage facilities to securely transmit and store data that the VA provides. This will make certain that privacy and security are maintained for veterans who volunteer for the programs.

I am grateful that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle have been able to come together and move this bill forward. Providing better care for our veterans is a place where we can find common ground, especially since America's veterans fought to keep us all safe, regardless of our political party.

In closing, I would like to thank my fellow Committee on Science, Space, and Technology members who cosponsored this legislation and the many veterans serving in the House who supported my bill. I also want to thank Secretary of Energy Rick Perry, who has been a strong advocate of this partnership.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to vote "yes" in favor of improving healthcare for veterans.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Puerto Rico (Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN).

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member LUCAS for yielding me the time.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 617, the Department of Energy Veterans' Health Initiative Act, introduced by my colleague, Congressman RALPH NORMAN from South Carolina.

I think this bill is very simple, but very essential at the same time. It essentially authorizes collaboration between the Department of Energy and the Department of Veterans Affairs to establish a program that facilitates computing capabilities to process data on health issues affecting all of our veterans. The bill will subsequently support the Veterans Administration with identifying potential health risks and challenges that our communities have.

I think it is important because combining those processing capabilities with health information compiled by the VA will help us to better understand the healthcare issues related to our veterans and the general population as well and ensures that both agencies will remain at the forefront of scientific and medical research.

I am a proud cosponsor of this bill on behalf of our veterans. Actually, we have more than 90,000 veterans registered in Puerto Rico, and we are very grateful to Congressman RALPH NORMAN for introducing this bill.

I want to also thank Chairwoman JOHNSON and Ranking Member LUCAS for their great work together on behalf of the scientific community and our veterans.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote in favor of this bill.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to close, since I have no additional speakers.

Mr. Speaker, simply put, H.R. 617 harnesses the power of DOE's supercomputers to revolutionize the way we care for America's veterans.

I want to thank Representative NORMAN for his leadership on this bill.

I strongly encourage my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to close by simply thanking all of the members of the full committee, as well as the staff, and to urge passage of this legislation, H.R. 617.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JOHNSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 617, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1530

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 23, 2019.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on July 23, 2019, at 11:34 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 1199.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

CHERYL L. JOHNSON.

OPPOSING GLOBAL BOYCOTT, DIVESTMENT, AND SANCTIONS MOVEMENT TARGETING ISRAEL

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 246) opposing efforts to delegitimize the State of Israel and the Global Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions Movement targeting Israel, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 246

Whereas the democratic, Jewish State of Israel is a key ally and strategic partner of the United States;

Whereas since Israel's founding in 1948, Congress has repeatedly expressed our Nation's unwavering commitment to the security of Israel as a Jewish and democratic state;

Whereas it is a hallmark of American democracy for citizens to petition the United States Government in favor of or against United States foreign policy;

Whereas the United States Constitution protects the rights of United States citizens to articulate political views, including with respect to the policies of the United States or foreign governments;

Whereas American policy has long sought to bring peace to the Middle East and recognized that both the Israeli and Palestinian people should be able to live in safe and sovereign states, free from fear and violence, with mutual recognition;

Whereas support for peace between the Israelis and Palestinians has long-standing bipartisan support in Congress;

Whereas it is the long-standing policy of the United States that a peaceful resolution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict should come through direct negotiations between the Government of Israel and the Palestinian Authority, with the support of countries in the region and around the world;

Whereas cooperation between Israel and the United States is of great importance, especially in the context of rising anti-Semitism, authoritarianism and security problems in Europe, the Middle East, and North Africa;

Whereas the Global Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions Movement (BDS Movement) targeting Israel is a campaign that does not favor a two-state solution and that seeks to

exclude the State of Israel and the Israeli people from the economic, cultural, and academic life of the rest of the world;

Whereas the Global Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions Movement is one of several recent political movements that undermines the possibility for a negotiated solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict by demanding concessions of one party alone and encouraging the Palestinians to reject negotiations in favor of international pressure;

Whereas the founder of the Global BDS Movement, Omar Barghouti, has denied the right of the Jewish people in their homeland, saying, "We oppose a Jewish state in any part of Palestine. No Palestinian, rational Palestinian, not a sell-out Palestinian, will ever accept a Jewish state in Palestine.";

Whereas the Global BDS Movement targets not only the Israeli government but also Israeli academic, cultural, and civil society institutions, as well as individual Israeli citizens of all political persuasions, religions, and ethnicities, and in some cases even Jews of other nationalities who support Israel;

Whereas the Global BDS Movement does not recognize, and many of its supporters explicitly deny, the right of the Jewish people to national self-determination;

Whereas university-based Global BDS efforts violate the core goals of the university and global cultural development, which thrive on free and open exchange and debate, and in some cases, leads to the intimidation and harassment of Jewish students and others who support Israel;

Whereas the Global BDS Movement promotes principles of collective guilt, mass punishment, and group isolation, which are destructive of prospects for progress towards peace and a two-state solution;

Whereas boycotts and similar tools aimed at promoting racial justice and social change have been used effectively in the United States, South Africa, and other parts of the world; and

Whereas in contrast to protest movements that have sought racial justice and social change, the Global Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions Movement targeting Israel is not about promoting coexistence, civil rights, and political reconciliation but about questioning and undermining the very legitimacy of the country and its people: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) opposes the Global Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions Movement (BDS Movement) targeting Israel, including efforts to target United States companies that are engaged in commercial activities that are legal under United States law, and all efforts to delegitimize the State of Israel;

(2) urges Israelis and Palestinians to return to direct negotiations as the only way to achieve an end to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict;

(3) affirms the Constitutional right of United States citizens to free speech, including the right to protest or criticize the policies of the United States or foreign governments;

(4) supports the full implementation of the United States-Israel Strategic Partnership Act of 2014 (Public Law 113-296; 128 Stat. 4075) and new efforts to enhance government-wide, coordinated United States-Israel scientific and technological cooperation in civilian areas, such as with respect to energy, water, agriculture, alternative fuel technology, civilian space technology, and security, in order to counter the effects of actions to boycott, divest from, or sanction Israel; and

(5) reaffirms its strong support for a negotiated solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict resulting in two states—a demo-

cratic Jewish State of Israel, and a viable, democratic Palestinian state—living side-by-side in peace, security, and mutual recognition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Res. 246.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me start by thanking the authors of this resolution, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. NADLER, Mr. ZELDIN, and Mrs. WAGNER. I am grateful for their bipartisan leadership.

Mr. Speaker, there are 339 cosponsors of this resolution. Let me say that again: There are 339 cosponsors for this measure opposing the global Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions movement that undermines the legitimacy of the State of Israel.

Support for Israel in Congress is an issue that has been like catnip for our friends in the press that cover our work. Frankly, this issue has been politicized in a way that I find ugly and is ultimately harmful to the U.S.-Israel relationship. It is time that leaders stop playing politics with our relations with the Jewish state.

When the fog clears, and the bullies on their pulpits end their tirades, what you see with this measure is a real bipartisan reflection on how this body regards our country's relationship with and support for Israel and our opposition to BDS. Almost 80 percent of House Members are cosponsors, and we are here debating it under suspension of the rules.

What this resolution says is simple. It says that support for BDS and support for a two-state solution just aren't compatible. Let me explain why, and I hope this explanation will also help to address some of the concerns about this measure.

Opposing BDS isn't about opposing any individual's right to protest or boycott. The right of any person to express views like that is enshrined in our Constitution. That sort of free expression is a pillar of American democracy, and this resolution says so. Let me read from it:

"Whereas it is a hallmark of American democracy for citizens to petition the United States Government in favor of or against United States foreign policy;

"Whereas the United States Constitution protects the rights of United States citizens to articulate political views, including with respect to the

policies of the United States or foreign governments."

That is in this resolution. It couldn't be any clearer, Mr. Speaker.

Throughout history, protests, boycotts, and movements like that have played key roles in driving important change. The resolution says that, too:

"Whereas boycotts and similar tools aimed at promoting racial justice and social change have been used effectively in the United States, South Africa, and other parts of the world."

But here is the thing about the global BDS movement: I don't believe it promotes racial justice or social change at all. It promotes a one-sided view of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict that seeks to marginalize Israel and that would deny the Jewish people the right of national self-determination, a right proclaimed by none other than the United Nations.

Many of us have been fighting for years to advance a future for the Israelis and Palestinians of two states for two peoples living side by side in peace and security. Building that future will require hard work and concessions.

BDS says that the onus is entirely on Israel. All concessions have to come from Israel, and the Palestinians should reject negotiations and just allow international pressure to build on Israel.

That is not how negotiations work, and it is no way to promote peace. That is why this movement is so counterproductive, in my view.

Do you want to criticize a government? That is your right. Do you want to stop buying products from a certain country? That is also your right.

But participating in an international commercial effort that undermines Israel's legitimacy and scuttles the chances of a two-state solution isn't the same as an individual exercising First Amendment rights.

I continue to believe that a two-state solution that guarantees self-determination for both Jews and Palestinians—not one or the other—is the best way to solve the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. I believe that the overwhelming majority of our colleagues in this body agree with me, and Congress has said so before in bipartisan resolutions.

Today, we have the opportunity to reiterate that point and to warn against something that would derail that solution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,

Washington, DC, July 19, 2019.

Hon. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON,
Chairwoman, Committee on Science, Space and Technology, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRWOMAN JOHNSON: I am writing to you concerning H.Res. 246, Opposing efforts to delegitimize the State of Israel and the Global Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions Movement targeting Israel. I appreciate your willingness to work cooperatively on this resolution.

I acknowledge that provisions of the resolution fall within jurisdiction of the Committee on Science, Space and Technology under House Rule X, and that your Committee will forgo action on H.Res. 246 to expedite floor consideration. I further acknowledge that the inaction of your Committee with respect to the resolution does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over the matters contained in the measure that fall within your jurisdiction.

I will ensure that our exchange of letters is included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the resolution. I appreciate your cooperation and look forward to continuing to work with you as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

ELIOT L. ENGEL,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND
TECHNOLOGY,

Washington, DC, July 19, 2019.

CHAIRMAN ELIOT ENGEL,
Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ENGEL: I am writing to you concerning H.Res. 246, "Opposing efforts to delegitimize the State of Israel and the Global Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions Movement targeting Israel." This resolution was sequentially referred to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology ("Science Committee") on March 21, 2019.

The Science Committee will forgo action on H.Res. 246 in order to expedite floor consideration. This is, however, not a waiver of future jurisdictional claims by the Science Committee over this subject matter. Additionally, thank you for agreeing to include our exchange of letters in the Congressional Record.

Sincerely,

EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON,
Chairwoman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,

Washington, DC, July 19, 2019.

Hon. JERROLD NADLER,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN NADLER: I am writing to you concerning H.Res. 246, Opposing efforts to delegitimize the State of Israel and the Global Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions Movement targeting Israel. I appreciate your willingness to work cooperatively on this resolution.

I acknowledge that provisions of the resolution fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Judiciary under House Rule X, and that your Committee will forgo action on H.Res. 246 to expedite floor consideration. I further acknowledge that the inaction of your Committee with respect to the resolution does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over the matters contained in the measure that fall within your jurisdiction.

I will ensure that our exchange of letters is included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the resolution. I appreciate your cooperation and look forward to continuing to work with you as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

ELIOT L. ENGEL,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, July 19, 2019.

Hon. ELIOT ENGEL,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ENGEL: This is to advise you that the Committee on the Judiciary has now had an opportunity to review the provisions in H.Res. 246, Opposing efforts to delegitimize the State of Israel and the Global Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions Movement targeting Israel, that fall within our Rule X jurisdiction. I appreciate your consulting with us on those provisions. The Judiciary Committee has no objection to your including them in the resolution for consideration on the House floor, and to expedite that consideration is willing to forgo action on H.Res. 246, with the understanding that we do not thereby waive any future jurisdictional claim over those provisions or their subject matters.

Please place this letter into the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House floor. Thank you for the cooperative spirit in which you have worked regarding this matter and others between our committees.

Sincerely,

JERROLD NADLER,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,

Washington, DC, July 19, 2019.

Hon. MAXINE WATERS,
Chairwoman, Committee on Financial Services,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRWOMAN WATERS: I am writing to you concerning H.Res. 246, Opposing efforts to delegitimize the State of Israel and the Global Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions Movement targeting Israel. I appreciate your willingness to work cooperatively on this resolution.

I acknowledge that provisions of the resolution fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Financial Services under House Rule X, and that your Committee will forgo action on H.Res. 246 to expedite floor consideration. I further acknowledge that the inaction of your Committee with respect to the resolution does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over the matters contained in the measure that fall within your jurisdiction.

I will ensure that our exchange of letters is included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the resolution. I appreciate your cooperation and look forward to continuing to work with you as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

ELIOT L. ENGEL,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES,

Washington, DC, July 22, 2019.

Hon. ELIOT ENGEL,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing concerning H.Res. 246, Opposing efforts to delegitimize the State of Israel and the Global Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions targeting Israel.

Because you have been working with the Committee on Financial Services concerning provisions in H.Res. 246 that fall within our Rule X jurisdiction, I agree to forgo formal consideration of H.Res. 246 so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor. The Committee on Financial Services takes this action to forego formal consideration of

H.Res. 246 with our mutual understanding that, by foregoing formal consideration of H.Res. 246 at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation.

Finally, I would request that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of H.Res. 246.

Sincerely,

MAXINE WATERS,
Chairwoman.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support H. Res. 246. This is a bipartisan resolution I introduced with BRAD SCHNEIDER, JERRY NADLER, and ANN WAGNER to oppose BDS and efforts to delegitimize the State of Israel, which is now up to 350 cosponsors.

We must combat the BDS movement targeting our great ally in the Middle East. The BDS movement seeks to harm Israel today, tomorrow, and well into the future.

It is an American value to be able to express legitimate, reasonable criticism of any government in the world, including our own. The BDS movement, though, is different, and we must reject the blatant anti-Semitism injected throughout BDS and the delegitimizing of Israel.

We must educate and all be aware of the toxic, anti-Semitic words of the founder of BDS and how we have so many Jewish students on college campuses right here in the United States from coast to coast targeted with blatant anti-Semitism in the name of BDS.

Congress needs to make a very strong, bipartisan statement against BDS, and this resolution does just that. In addition, we should also enact legislation with teeth.

In February, the Senate passed anti-BDS legislation, S. 1, with a strong, bipartisan vote. This bill allows State and local governments to adopt laws to divest public funds from entities that boycott Israel. Lead Republican MCCAUL already has a bill in the House, H.R. 336, that is identical to S. 1 and contains the anti-BDS legislation.

I strongly encourage the Speaker to bring this bill to the floor as well so that not only are we making a strong statement, but we are also doing something about it.

I am grateful to House leadership for bringing H. Res. 246 to the floor today, for Chairman ENGEL's work and his team's work in the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and to lead Republican MCCAUL and his team.

Mr. Speaker, this is a big deal. I am honored to work with you on this important effort, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), who is the chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 246. This resolution, modeled on legislation passed

by the New York City Council, is fully consistent with the First Amendment and affirms the rights of those who support the global BDS movement to voice their opinions. Importantly, it also puts Congress on RECORD rejecting this misguided and deceptive movement that is neither progressive in its conduct nor pro-peace in its ultimate mission.

BDS proponents advocate for a complete boycott of Israeli businesses, individuals, and institutions—including academic institutions, which are supposed to be bastions of intellectual freedom—hypocritically seeking to deny all Israeli citizens the same rights and freedoms that BDS supporters claim that they themselves are denied.

Not only does the movement, at times, invoke anti-Semitic tropes and seemingly promote violence, it unfairly blames one party in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and does nothing to promote direct negotiations to achieve a two-state solution, which is the only path to a fair peace.

In fact, the founder of the movement, when asked whether BDS would end when Palestinians were able to establish their own state, flatly says “no.” That tells you everything you need to know, Mr. Speaker.

Instead of promoting peace and a two-state solution, the mission of BDS is clear: to delegitimize Israel, regardless of its policies or conduct, and to deny the Jewish people, and only the Jewish people, the right of national self-determination.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), who is a senior member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

I applaud Mr. SCHNEIDER and Mr. ZELDIN for sponsoring this important resolution. I especially thank Chairman ELIOT ENGEL for his very eloquent comments a moment ago.

Not wishing to be redundant, I will just say this because I associate myself with their strong and persuasive remarks: The great former Soviet refusenik and religious prisoner Natan Sharansky, who testified at two of about a dozen hearings that I have chaired on combating anti-Semitism, proposed what he called a simple test to help us distinguish legitimate criticism of Israel from anti-Semitism. Sharansky called it the three Ds, demonization, double standard, and delegitimization.

When the three Ds are advanced, we know that anti-Semitism is the issue. The BDS movement demonizes Israel and, by extension, Jews, who are always cast in the role of oppressors, who are always in the wrong. In so doing, it applies a double standard, whereby Israel is always wrong and the oppressed Palestinians are always in the

right, regardless of whether groups such as Hamas are engaging in terrorist acts upon Israeli citizens. The objective of this is to delegitimize the State of Israel, to deny its very right to exist.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud them on this bill, and I hope this vote is unanimous.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER), who is the author of this resolution.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I proudly rise today in support of H. Res. 246, of which I am the sponsor.

This resolution does four things.

First, it affirms the vital relationship between the United States and Israel, our most important ally in a complicated region of the world.

Second, it reiterates our unbreakable commitment to Israel's security.

Third, it restates Congress' strong, bipartisan support for a negotiated two-state solution.

Lastly, it makes clear that Congress opposes the global Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions, or BDS, movement that seeks to delegitimize Israel; opposes a two-state solution; and pushes the cause of peace for both Israelis and Palestinians further out of reach.

It has been our country's long-held policy that the best path to ensuring Israel's long-term security as a democratic and Jewish state, and realizing the Palestinian people's aspirations for a state of their own, is through a negotiated two-state solution.

The global BDS movement, on the other hand, denies the Jewish people's connection to the land of Israel; refuses to accept the basic idea of a Jewish state; and seeks to delegitimize Israel in international forums, on college campuses, and in global commerce.

But don't take my word for it. The founder of the global BDS movement, Omar Barghouti, has said as much: “We oppose a Jewish state in any part of Palestine. No Palestinian, rational Palestinian, not a sellout Palestinian, will ever accept a Jewish state in Palestine.”

When global BDS movement supporters chant, “From the river to the sea, Palestine will be free,” these are not words of peace. This is a call for the destruction of the entire State of Israel and the elimination of the Jews from the land—all the land, not just Gaza and the West Bank.

That is why it is so important that we take a stand today and vote to condemn the global BDS movement.

Let me also be clear: This resolution explicitly recognizes that boycotts have a long tradition in this country, including the civil rights movement, efforts to end apartheid in South Africa, and other matters. However, not all boycotts seek just ends.

Such is the case of the BDS movement against Israel and its fundamental aims: the delegitimization of Israel and the destruction of the Jewish state.

I am proud that this resolution has gained 350 cosponsors, including more than three-quarters of the Members of both parties. I would like to thank the leadership of my Democratic colead Congressman JERRY NADLER as well as the efforts of our Republican coleads, Representatives LEE ZELDIN and ANN WAGNER.

This strong, bipartisan support sends a clear, united message that this Congress not only supports the Jewish, democratic State of Israel and two states as the path to peace for both Israelis and Palestinians but that at the same time we condemn efforts to delegitimize and block the path to peace.

□ 1545

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the esteemed Republican whip.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate both of my colleagues from New York, the distinguished gentlemen, Mr. ZELDIN and Mr. ENGEL, for their strong leadership in standing up against this BDS movement.

I think we all know what it is designed to do. It is designed to delegitimize Israel as a Jewish state and to undermine their economy, which ultimately goes to the heart of trying to bring down Israel by people who have been against a Jewish state and expressed anti-Semitism for decades. We all need to stand up against that, and so this resolution is incredibly important.

As my other colleague just mentioned, our nations had a rich history of using boycotts to promote freedom. There are other boycotts that have been displayed to undermine freedom, and that is really where the BDS movement is in a very different category. I think we all need to make that distinction.

If a boycott is being used to advance freedom, that is one we should support; but if a boycott is being used to undermine the very freedoms that exist in the only real elected democracy in the Middle East, we all need to rise up against that as people who respect that great tradition, that great love between the United States and Israel, an unbreakable bond, one that brings Republicans and Democrats together. We need to continue that tradition.

But I would also add, Mr. Speaker, that, as we are talking about why we need to oppose the BDS movement with this resolution, words are hollow if we don't follow it up with action. So, at the same time, Mr. Speaker, hopefully, we get an overwhelming, maybe unanimous, vote on this resolution.

It is long past time that the Democratic leadership of this House bring up H.R. 336 by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. McCAUL), the bill that actually puts teeth in the law to stand up against the BDS movement all around the world.

Here, even, sometimes in Congress or in other states, but in other countries

where they are trying to advance this movement, we need teeth—words and action. So these are words today. We need to follow it up with H.R. 336, real action.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that we stand strong together.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MURPHY).

Mrs. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the State of Israel. It is a homeland for the Jewish people and a sanctuary from anti-Semitism. Israel is a thriving democracy, and its citizens have made enormous contributions to our global society.

The U.S. has no better friend than Israel. And, yes, on occasion, our two governments will disagree on certain policies, as all sovereign nations do, but our strong alliance is rooted in shared values, shared security interest, and a deep historical connection.

I also believe the Palestinian people have legitimate aspirations, deserve a better future, and should have their own state. I support direct negotiations between the parties leading to two states living together in peace and security.

I support this bipartisan resolution because the BDS movement makes a just peace harder, not easier. It unfairly vilifies Israel, blaming it, and it alone, for this complex conflict.

American citizens have the right to boycott, and boycotts often promote positive change, but the BDS movement is misguided and harmful, and Congress should say so unequivocally.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH), chairman of the Subcommittee on the Middle East, North Africa, and International Terrorism, and a valued member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman ENGEL for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support H. Res. 246 and to voice my relentless opposition to the Global Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions campaign that seeks to delegitimize the State of Israel and deny the Jewish people—and only the Jewish people—the right to self-determination.

This resolution reminds us that boycotts have been previously used as tools for social justice in this very country. But BDS doesn't seek social justice. It seeks a world in which the State of Israel does not exist.

It is not incompatible to support a strong, secure Jewish State of Israel and to support human rights, dignity, and prosperity for the Palestinian people. It is incompatible, however, to support BDS and claim to support two states for two people when BDS envisions Palestine from the river to the sea, one state, and the other, rejection of the Jewish State of Israel.

You simply will not, and cannot, achieve lasting peace and security for

both Israelis and Palestinians and work toward a two-state solution if you support a movement that seeks to delegitimize the very existence of Israel.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. NADLER, and Mrs. WAGNER, for bringing this resolution to the floor today. I strongly support their efforts.

I strongly support this resolution condemning BDS, and I urge all of my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, it is important to note, really, from coast to coast, we are hearing stories of students on college campuses, in the name of BDS, being targeted with blatant anti-Semitism.

For example, at New York University, after the student government passed a resolution supporting BDS, the Bronfman Center for Jewish Life was temporarily closed in response to threatening Twitter posts by a student who expressed “a desire for Zionists to die.”

A University of Michigan professor refused to write a letter of recommendation for a qualified student solely because she wanted to study abroad in Israel.

A Students for Justice in Palestine cofounder and University of California, Berkeley, professor spoke at a national conference and shared the anti-Semitism meme of an Orthodox Jewish person in his presentation.

At Warren Wilson College, an invited speaker stated: “Jews are doing the same thing to the Palestinians as the Nazis did to the Jews.”

A Yik Yak posting at the University of California read: “Gas them, burn them, and dismantle their power structure. Humanity cannot progress with the parasitic Jew.”

More globally, University of Durban in South Africa called for the expulsion of Jewish students who did not support the BDS movement at the university.

It is really important for people who may just be getting familiar with what BDS is to know that, right now, we have so many Jewish students who are being targeted with this blatant anti-Semitism, and that is why today's statement sends such a powerful message.

Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge the House to pass this resolution which opposes efforts to delegitimize the State of Israel through the global Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions Movement. This resolution reiterates that there is a viable pathway to peace: through direct negotiations to achieve two states for two people.

If implemented, the BDS movement would blacklist Israeli businesses, dev-

astate the Israeli economy, and create doubt about Israel's legitimacy among the next generation. That undermines any possibility of achieving a lasting peace.

The global rise of anti-Semitism is manifesting itself in many terrifying ways, and we must remain vigilant. This resolution is paramount in ensuring that BDS supporters cannot utilize this movement to promote an anti-Semitic agenda.

BDS does not seek and will not help achieve Israeli-Palestinian peace. In fact, it pushes the hope for a two-state solution even further away. BDS only gives fodder to Israel's enemies who seek to destroy her and isolate her from the rest of the world.

Direct, bilateral negotiations between the parties is the only option for a viable, long-lasting peace.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, some supporters of the BDS movement—in fact, the movement, in total, makes the argument that Israel is the bad guy on humanitarian issues, on human rights.

It is important to note, Israel has a long history of LGBT protections and women's rights enshrined in Israeli law that is in stark contrast to its Middle East neighbors.

Regardless of ethnicity or religion, there are broad freedoms in Israel, including the right to vote, freedom of speech, equal access to education and the workplace, and no special restrictions on the way women dress. By law, women are protected from discrimination.

In fact, Israel's declaration of independence grants all Israel's inhabitants equality of social and political rights, irrespective of religion, race, or gender. Even Palestinians in the autonomous regions have voting rights and receive social services.

Under Israeli jurisdiction, some 350,000 Palestinian residents in Jerusalem receive certain civilian welfare, health, and municipal services. In other parts of the Middle East, it is a monarchy with no voting rights whatsoever.

Hamas has repeatedly denied humanitarian aid offered by Israel. In May 2018, when there were clashes on the border, Gaza refused two truckloads of aid from Israel to relieve medical shortages.

There are so many falsehoods that have been perpetrated by supporters of the BDS movement, and that is, again, another reason why today's resolution is such a powerful statement.

Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SUOZZI), my very good friend.

Mr. SUOZZI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the BDS campaign has been heralded by critics and enemies of

Israel as a penalty for what they claim is Israel's oppression of the Palestine people. Nothing could be further from the truth.

These critics and enemies of Israel are, in reality, simply adding the BDS campaign to their arsenal of weapons to try and isolate, weaken, delegitimize, and, ultimately, destroy the State of Israel, as they have for decades.

For over 70 years, Israelis have faced repeated terrorism, bombs detonated on public buses, in cafes, and at religious observances. This terrorism has been beaten back by a nation simply trying to defend itself and persevere under withering attacks.

So now Israel's enemies have adopted a new strategy. BDS is an anti-Semitic movement, plain and simple.

The founder of BDS, Omar Barghouti, said it very clearly: ". . . we oppose a Jewish state in any part of Palestine. No Palestinian . . . will ever accept a Jewish state."

The goals of BDS are clear. Just read their words.

Israel shall not and cannot yield. And we in the United States must stand with our ally that shares our values and has also worked with us.

Mr. Speaker, I urge strong bipartisan support of this bill.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. SUOZZI just pointed out one quote. Earlier, we heard another quote from the BDS founder. I will share one more. He also stated—and this is the founder of the BDS movement: "Many of the methods of collective and individual 'punishment' meted out to Palestinian civilians at the hands of young, racist, often sadistic and ever impervious Israeli soldiers . . . are reminiscent of the common Nazi practices against the Jews."

The list goes on and on. As people out there are listening to this debate, becoming familiar with what the BDS movement is, just understand and take heed of the words from the BDS movement founder, Omar Barghouti.

Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GOTTHEIMER).

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this bipartisan solution opposing the boycott of Israel and supporting a two-state solution.

I want to thank Chairman ENGEL for his excellent leadership on this important issue and Speaker PELOSI and Majority Leader HOYER for bringing this resolution to the floor.

With this bill and 349 cosponsors, it is very clear that Members of both parties support our vital ally, Israel, the leading democracy in the Middle East, because our countries share common interests and fundamental values, and Israel's security is key to America's security—to fighting Hezbollah, Hamas, PIJ, and global terror.

However, the Global Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions, BDS, Movement

seeks to delegitimize Israel and deny its right to exist as a Jewish state.

As Mr. SUOZZI, my colleague, just so aptly read, the founder of BDS, Omar Barghouti, said it very clearly: "Definitely, most definitely, we oppose a Jewish state in any part of Palestine. No Palestinian, rational Palestinian, not a sell-out Palestinian, will ever accept a Jewish state."

That exactly captures what we are fighting here today. There are few clearer examples of bias and double standards than the BDS movement. No other democratic country faces a global boycott.

But BDS is also fundamentally incompatible with a two-state solution, which I strongly support. BDS seeks to punish only Israel, and it rejects direct negotiations in favor of unilateral strategy. That is why it is so important that Congress goes on record opposing BDS and other harmful efforts to single out and delegitimize Israel.

Standing up for the U.S.-Israel relationship should not be a partisan issue. That is why the members of the Problem Solvers Caucus are proud to support this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey.

□ 1600

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. This resolution was introduced by our colleague Congressman BRAD SCHNEIDER, along with Congressman LEE ZELDIN, Chairman JERRY NADLER, and Congresswoman ANN WAGNER.

They have all done an excellent job. Nothing in this resolution would prevent anyone, in any way, from being able to engage in free speech. That is not what this is about, and we must not allow false attacks on Israel.

Mr. Speaker, today, we must continue to make sure that confronting biased anti-Semitism and supporting a two-state solution remain bipartisan priorities.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

BDS supporters also claim that the BDS movement is nonviolent. The BDS movement does not distance itself from Hamas, a designated Foreign Terrorist Organization. BDS supporters, individually, are not distancing themselves from Hamas either. Instead, their criticism is focused on attacking Israel and, in many cases, the Jewish people specifically.

Two Fridays ago, Fathi Hammad, a senior Hamas official, called upon Palestinians worldwide: "Our brothers" in the diaspora "are still preparing. They are trying to prepare. They are warming up. A long time has passed with them warming up. All of you 7 million Palestinians abroad, enough of the warming up. You have Jews everywhere, and we must attack every Jew on the globe by way of slaughter and killing, if God permits. Enough of the warming up."

Where are all the supporters of BDS condemning these remarks? This is two Fridays ago, calling for the murder of every Jew in the world.

During a closed meeting in October 2017 between Hamas chief Sinwar and Gazan youth about reconciling with the Fatah movement, Sinwar stated that the time spent discussing recognition of Israel is over and that now Hamas will, instead, discuss when they will wipe out Israel.

Hamas uses women and children as human shields. They deny humanitarian aid to their own people. They incite violence. They have launched rockets into Israel, killing innocent civilians. They have declared that jihad is an obligation. That list goes on.

The Palestinian Authority, not only do they incite violence, but they financially reward terror, by policy. If you kill an Israeli or an American, you get called a martyr. You will have streets and football stadiums renamed after you. You and your family will get paid money.

There are existential threats all around Israel. To the north, with Hezbollah, another designated Foreign Terrorist Organization, they have built terror tunnels. They have amassed tens of thousands of rockets on the border between Lebanon and Israel.

Every year, Hamas mobilizes Palestinians in their Days of Rage to attack Israelis at the border, calling on people to throw rocks and fire missiles at Israel, which often result in actual violence, including death, targeting innocent civilians.

This past May, Hamas fired approximately 700 rockets into Israel, killing innocent civilians. Hamas has used incendiary kites and balloons, which have destroyed some 8,000 acres of Israeli farms, parks, and forests.

Earlier this year, Hamas carried out the Salift operation, sending out operatives to murder Israelis, including Rabbi Achiad Ettinger, a father of 12.

Where are all the BDS supporters in the United States, on college campuses, people who are involved in American politics, those who are at the United Nations, those who are abroad? Where is their voice right now? If everything that they say about their cause is legitimate and reasonable, that their concern is one that the entire world should be taking heed of and caution to, where is their voice condemning all the actual violence right now of Palestinian terrorists murdering innocent Israelis and, in some cases, Americans?

Taylor Force—the Taylor Force Act that this Chamber passed and was signed into law—he was a United States Military Academy graduate, an Army veteran, a United States Army veteran, who was killed. The PA pays those terrorists and their families to commit those terrorist acts.

We are here in this Chamber to call that out for exactly what it is, in bipartisan fashion.

I appreciate Chairman ENGEL's work at the Foreign Affairs Committee. I see

Chairman DEUTCH is still here, along with many other voices around this Capitol who believe strongly in this effort on the other side of the aisle. We need to work together to combat the BDS movement. This is an important next step.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time for the purpose of closing.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN) has 7 minutes remaining. The gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, with regard to the BDS movement, the supporters make territorial claims as it relates to Gaza, Judea and Samaria, the West Bank.

Let's clear up the record a little more on that. Judea and Samaria, often referred to as the West Bank, contain disputed territory, not occupied territory. Israel ended up with this territory after it was attacked, before there was even a Palestinian Authority. Time and again, the PA has rejected peace proposals because they refuse, publicly and privately, to accept a Jewish state in Israel. That is on them. In 2008, Israel offered to withdraw from 93 percent from Judea and Samaria.

As for Gaza, Hamas, a designated Foreign Terrorist Organization, they are in charge. There is no Israeli occupation there. This small strip of land is packed out with 1.7 million people living in sub-Third World country conditions because of Hamas. As was pointed out earlier, Hamas refuses humanitarian aid, uses women and children as human shields, calls jihad as an obligation, and murders innocent civilians.

One of the most important reasons we are here today is not only making a strong statement in opposition to the BDS movement but also to refute all the lies that are being told out there.

People will speak up to try to justify the hate that is filling the ranks of the BDS movement, and they will never tell you the other 100 percent of the story. This Chamber today comes together, Republicans and Democrats, both sides of the aisle, to make that powerful statement.

There is a list of victims—we don't have enough time to go through it—of Palestinian violence and terrorism in 2019. Mr. Speaker, 1,355 people have been killed by Palestinian violence and terrorism since September of 2000—1,355 people.

Never will the BDS supporters take any opportunity to set the record straight on any of that, but we will here.

I see that BRAD SCHNEIDER is with us as well, the main author of the bill. This is a bipartisan effort that I am very proud to be part of today.

Mr. Speaker, I thank all of my colleagues for speaking today, as well as Chris Smith and Minority Whip SCALISE. This is something that we are very passionate about.

We also believe that the strong statement that is going to be made here today with this vote is not the last step of this Chamber's speaking out. I really hope that we all can work together in a bipartisan fashion to figure out how to do something about it, to be able to pass legislation with teeth.

Today is nothing short of progress, and it is something for all of us to be proud of around our country and around the world because it should be an American value to stand strong, shoulder to shoulder with our great ally, our greatest ally in the Middle East in Israel. It is a beacon of hope, freedom, liberty, and opportunity.

Americans, in our day-to-day lives, don't even realize just how much we are using Israeli technology, American companies that have used Israeli technology. We probably have used it multiple times just today.

You can't boycott Israel and, at the same exact time, spend your entire day using Israeli technology. You can't boycott Israel and travel to Israel.

We are going to call out the hypocrisies that exist. Ultimately, as we flush this out, let's work together. This is about advocacy. It is also about education.

When I came to Congress in 2015, honestly, there were a lot of Members of Congress that, if you asked them, "Where do you stand on the BDS movement?" their answer would have been, "What is BDS?"

Now, in 2019, here we are, July 2019, coming together. We know what BDS is: Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions movement. We know it is filled with anti-Israel hate. We know it is about delegitimizing Israel. We know that it is filled with anti-Semitism, from the founder of BDS to those in the name of BDS on college campuses from coast to coast.

I plead with all of my colleagues, if we can all work together as we move past this great vote today, that we can next pass legislation that has teeth in it.

Mr. Speaker, I thank, again, BRAD SCHNEIDER, JERRY NADLER, ANN WAGNER, the 350 cosponsors, and, hopefully, everyone today voting "yes." I thank lead Republican MICHAEL MCCAUL on the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

This is a resolution for us all to be proud of. We should all vote "yes," tell all of our constituents about it, and redouble our efforts to do something about it right after that vote.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I am really heartened by the outpouring of support we have heard from both sides of the aisle involving the U.S.-Israel relation-

ship and involving the unfair BDS movement against Israel.

I thank all the people who have spoken in favor of this resolution—the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN) and others who have spoken—because it shows that, when it comes to support for the U.S.-Israel relationship, there really is no difference between Democrats and Republicans.

Israel should not be a political football. We support the U.S.-Israel relationship, and we know that BDS is very destructive, very unfair, very anti-Jewish, anti-Semitic, and should have no place in the public spectrum.

I think that this Chamber is getting together. If we look at the numbers we bring to the floor today, they really speak for themselves. Almost 80 percent of the House of Representatives has cosponsored this resolution.

There are Members not just from different sides of the aisle but from across the entire political spectrum, from one end to the other, supporting this resolution, saying the BDS movement is unfair, that the BDS movement singles out Israel, that the BDS movement is really supported by people who want to see the destruction of the world's only Jewish state, and that is not something that we can stand idly by and watch happen.

I have never been prouder of this body—and I have been here for a while now—than I am tonight. I am proud of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

Again, I think the reason why we have that kind of support is clear. Congress supports the U.S.-Israel relationship. We support a two-state solution. We support the rights enshrined in the First Amendment.

We know that the global BDS movement threatens the possibility of future peace between Israelis and Palestinians. It is that simple.

We know that the global BDS movement threatens what is fair. We know that the global BDS movement is really a fraud. It is a fraud. It is Israel-hating. It is Jew-hating.

We have had enough of that in the world. Frankly, they should be ashamed of themselves.

I would like to note that today's resolution is a very powerful rebuke of the global BDS movement, more powerful than any particular legislative proposal. What we are saying today, to those who want to see a peaceful end to the Palestinian-Israeli conflict, is that the global BDS movement has no place here.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to support this measure. I urge all Members to do likewise. Again, I thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. I have never seen Congress as united as it is on this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I support House Resolution 246, opposing the anti-Semitic Global Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions—or BDS—movement and all efforts to delegitimize the State of Israel.

It is important that we clearly state our opposition to the BDS movement, as this non-binding resolution with 349 cosponsors before us does. However, it is even more important that we take strong legislative actions to defend Israel.

As hateful as this growing movement is, sadly, it is not new.

Over 40 years ago, the Arab League began its boycott of Israel. In response to this boycott, Congress passed a law that makes it illegal to participate in foreign boycotts of U.S. allies.

Today, the Global BDS movement seeks to pressure Israel by using Israel's participation in the global economy, in academic exchanges, and in cultural activities as leverage.

For example, the BDS movement tries to pressure recording artists from performing in Israel.

It tries to keep students from studying abroad in Israel. It tries to keep consumers from purchasing Israeli goods.

Not only is the BDS movement antithetical to the values of openness and exchange shared by the United States, Israel, and free democracies all over the world, it is antithetical to peace.

As threats to U.S. allies, including Israel, evolve over time, we must update our policies to effectively stand with our partners. In weakening Israel, the global BDS movement endangers the national security of the United States.

I introduced a real legislative solution in January—H.R. 336, the Strengthening America's Security in the Middle East Act. This bill has direct policy implications by allowing state and local governments to adopt laws to divest public funds from entities that boycott Israel.

Additionally, it would sanction the Assad regime and its backers for their malign activities, and strengthen our support for Israel and Jordan.

While I support today's resolution, I regret that we are not considering H.R. 336 instead. The Senate companion to H.R. 336, S.1, was the first bill the Senate considered this Congress, demonstrating how urgent it was.

It passed with robust bipartisan support.

But, neither S.1, nor my House companion H. R. 336, have received consideration in this body.

Standing up for Israel has never been a difficult decision for the United States Congress.

It wasn't difficult for Senator CHUCK SCHUMER when he voted in favor of S.1, and it wasn't difficult for over half of the Democrats and nearly all Republicans in the Senate when they too supported the bill.

Just as we passed the original anti-boycott act 40 years ago, we must update our laws to protect our interests.

When foreign entities foster boycotts against Israel in the United States, they are interfering in U.S. policy, and it is appropriate for our government to respond.

We take a first step today by publicly acknowledging BDS is dangerous and anti-Semitic; but tomorrow we must take real actions—and advance the real policies in my bill—to protect Israel and combat the BDS movement.

I want to thank Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. ZELDIN, Ms. WAGNER, Mr. NADLER, Chairman ENGEL and the Foreign Affairs Committee Membership for their bipartisan work to counter this threat to our friend and ally Israel.

I sincerely hope all Members vote in favor of this resolution that shows our solidarity with our friend and ally Israel, and hope we can vote on my bill this week.

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, peaceful dissent and the protesting of injustice are the right of all Americans guaranteed by the Constitution. It is called freedom of speech. H. Res. 246 renounces the peaceful promotion of human rights, self-determination, and justice on behalf of Palestinian people living under Israeli military occupation. At the same time, this resolution completely ignores the Netanyahu government's brutality, dehumanization, and subjugation of Palestinian people at the root of this peaceful movement.

The State of Israel is a sovereign nation, an ally of the United States, and a military power that occupies Palestinian lands for the benefit of Jewish settlers. H. Res. 246 originally claimed that the use of voluntary boycotts, divestment, and sanctions "undermines the possibility of a negotiated solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict." I am pleased that this language has been removed.

I am also very pleased that resolving clause 3 was added to affirm the Constitutional right of U.S. citizens to free speech, including "the right to protest or criticize the policies of the United States or a foreign government."

Israel cannot be delegitimized by any outside movement, it is a nation-state that is selfgoverned and makes its own laws, its own policies. Sadly, and I say sadly because I want peace and security for the Israeli people, it is the actions of the Netanyahu government that delegitimizes Israel's standing in the world community.

Today's Washington Post ran a headline: "Israeli demolition of Palestinian homes provokes outcry." Is this the action of a nation seeking peaceful negotiations? Is the annexation of Palestinian lands or the military detention and torture of Palestinian children an effort to seek a negotiated peace agreement?

Under Prime Minister Netanyahu, Israel is engaged in a systemic, violent, and repressive strategy to annex Palestinian lands and permanently displace the Palestinian population, not seek a negotiated peace or a two-state solution. Shamefully, the President of the United States and the U.S. ambassador to Israel are enabling this effort in a reversal of decades of bipartisan U.S. foreign policy.

Actions by Congress, like passing H. Res. 246, which ignore reality and effectively supports military occupation, violations of international humanitarian law, and the subjugation of the Palestinian population, does not strengthen Israel, but it does damage the standing of the U.S. House in the eyes of the world.

It is time for Congress to exercise real American leadership that is based on our values and the belief that Israel deserves peace and security, and at the same time the Palestinian people deserve justice, equality, and an end to Israeli repression and occupation. H. Res. 246 offers nothing but the perpetuation of the status quo, repression, and conflict.

I am voting to oppose H. Res. 246.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 246, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

□ 1615

UNITED STATES-ISRAEL COOPERATION ENHANCEMENT AND REGIONAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1837) to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions and to authorize assistance for Israel, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1837

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE AND TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "United States-Israel Cooperation Enhancement and Regional Security Act".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title and table of contents.

TITLE I—ENHANCED COOPERATION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND ISRAEL

Sec. 101. Coordinator of United States-Israel Research and Development.

Sec. 102. Cooperation on directed energy capabilities.

Sec. 103. Cooperation on cybersecurity.

Sec. 104. Report on potential benefits and impact to the United States of establishing a joint United States-Israel Cybersecurity Center of Excellence.

Sec. 105. Cyber diplomacy officer.

Sec. 106. United States Agency for International Development Memorandum-Israel enhanced cooperation.

Sec. 107. Cooperative projects among the United States, Israel, and developing countries.

Sec. 108. Joint cooperative program related to innovation and high-tech for the Middle East region.

Sec. 109. Sense of Congress on Eastern Mediterranean energy cooperation.

Sec. 110. Cooperation on other matters.

TITLE II—SECURITY ASSISTANCE FOR ISRAEL

Sec. 201. Findings.

Sec. 202. Statement of policy.

Sec. 203. Contingency plans to provide Israel with necessary defense articles and services.

Sec. 204. Waiver for existing or imminent military threat to Israel.

Sec. 205. Security assistance for Israel.

Sec. 206. Joint assessment of quantity of precision guided munitions for use by Israel.

Sec. 207. Transfer of precision guided munitions to Israel.

Sec. 208. Sense of Congress on rapid acquisition and deployment procedures.

- Sec. 209. Extension of War Reserves Stockpile authority.
- Sec. 210. Eligibility of Israel for the strategic trade authorization exception to certain export control licensing requirements.
- Sec. 211. Extension of loan guarantees to Israel.
- Sec. 212. Definition.

TITLE III—JUSTICE FOR UNITED STATES VICTIMS OF PALESTINIAN TERRORISM

- Sec. 301. Short title.
- Sec. 302. Facilitation of the settlement of terrorism-related claims of nationals of the United States.
- Sec. 303. Modification to consent of certain parties to personal jurisdiction.

TITLE IV—BUDGETARY EFFECTS

- Sec. 401. Determination of budgetary effects.

TITLE I—ENHANCED COOPERATION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND ISRAEL

SEC. 101. COORDINATOR OF UNITED STATES-ISRAEL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President is encouraged to designate the Assistant Secretary of State for the Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs to act as Coordinator of United States-Israel Research and Development (in this section referred to as the “Coordinator”).

(b) AUTHORITIES AND DUTIES.—The Coordinator, in conjunction with the heads of relevant Federal Government departments and agencies and in coordination with the Israel Innovation Authority, shall oversee civilian science and technology programs on a joint basis with Israel.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Coordinator shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the implementation of this section.

(d) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

- (1) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives; and
- (2) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate.

SEC. 102. COOPERATION ON DIRECTED ENERGY CAPABILITIES.

(a) AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense, upon request of the Ministry of Defense of Israel and with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, is authorized to carry out research, development, test, and evaluation activities, on a joint basis with Israel, to establish directed energy capabilities that address threats to the United States, deployed forces of the United States, or Israel. Any activities carried out pursuant to such authority shall be conducted in a manner that appropriately protects sensitive information and the national security interests of the United States and the national security interests of Israel.

(2) REPORT.—The activities described in paragraph (1) may be carried out after the Secretary of Defense submits to the appropriate congressional committees a report setting forth the following:

(A) A memorandum of agreement between the United States and Israel regarding sharing of research and development costs for the capabilities described in paragraph (1), and any supporting documents.

(B) A certification that the memorandum of agreement—

(i) requires sharing of costs of projects, including in-kind support, between the United States and Israel;

(ii) establishes a framework to negotiate the rights to any intellectual property developed under the memorandum of agreement; and

(iii) requires the United States Government to receive semiannual reports on expenditure of funds, if any, by the Government of Israel, including a description of what the funds have been used for, when funds were expended, and an identification of entities that expended the funds.

(b) SUPPORT IN CONNECTION WITH ACTIVITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense is authorized to provide maintenance and sustainment support to Israel for the directed energy capabilities research, development, test, and evaluation activities authorized in subsection (a)(1). Such authority includes authority to install equipment necessary to carry out such research, development, test, and evaluation.

(2) REPORT.—The support described in paragraph (1) may not be provided until 15 days after the Secretary of Defense submits to the appropriate congressional committees a report setting forth a detailed description of the support to be provided.

(3) MATCHING CONTRIBUTION.—The support described in paragraph (1) may not be provided unless the Secretary of Defense certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that the Government of Israel will contribute to such support—

(A) an amount equal to not less than the amount of support to be so provided; or

(B) an amount that otherwise meets the best efforts of Israel, as mutually agreed to by the United States and Israel.

(c) LEAD AGENCY.—The Secretary of Defense shall designate an appropriate research and development entity of a military department as the lead agency of the Department of Defense in carrying out this section.

(d) SEMIANNUAL REPORT.—The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees on a semiannual basis a report that contains a copy of the most recent semiannual report provided by the Government of Israel to the Department of Defense pursuant to subsection (a)(2)(B)(iii).

(e) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Homeland Security, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

SEC. 103. COOPERATION ON CYBERSECURITY.

(a) GRANT PROGRAM.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary, in accordance with the agreement entitled the “Agreement between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the State of Israel on Cooperation in Science and Technology for Homeland Security Matters”, dated May 29, 2008 (or successor agreement), and the requirements specified in paragraph (2), shall establish a grant program at the Department to support—

(A) cybersecurity research and development; and

(B) demonstration and commercialization of cybersecurity technology.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—

(A) APPLICABILITY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in carrying out a re-

search, development, demonstration, or commercial application program or activity that is authorized under this section, the Secretary shall require cost sharing in accordance with this paragraph.

(B) RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), the Secretary shall require not less than 50 percent of the cost of a research, development, demonstration, or commercial application program or activity described in subparagraph (A) to be provided by a non-Federal source.

(ii) REDUCTION.—The Secretary may reduce or eliminate, on a case-by-case basis, the percentage requirement specified in clause (i) if the Secretary determines that such reduction or elimination is necessary and appropriate.

(C) MERIT REVIEW.—In carrying out a research, development, demonstration, or commercial application program or activity that is authorized under this section, awards shall be made only after an impartial review of the scientific and technical merit of the proposals for such awards has been carried out by or for the Department.

(D) REVIEW PROCESSES.—In carrying out a review under subparagraph (C), the Secretary may use merit review processes developed under section 302(14) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 182(14)).

(3) ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS.—An applicant shall be eligible to receive a grant under this subsection if the project of such applicant—

(A) addresses a requirement in the area of cybersecurity research or cybersecurity technology, as determined by the Secretary; and

(B) is a joint venture between—

(i) (I) a for-profit business entity, academic institution, National Laboratory (as defined in section 2 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15801)), or nonprofit entity in the United States; and

(II) a for-profit business entity, academic institution, or nonprofit entity in Israel; or

(ii) (I) the Federal Government; and

(II) the Government of Israel.

(4) APPLICATIONS.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this subsection, an applicant shall submit to the Secretary an application for such grant in accordance with procedures established by the Secretary, in consultation with the advisory board established under paragraph (5).

(5) ADVISORY BOARD.—

(A) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish an advisory board to—

(i) monitor the method by which grants are awarded under this subsection; and

(ii) provide to the Secretary periodic performance reviews of actions taken to carry out this subsection.

(B) COMPOSITION.—The advisory board established under subparagraph (A) shall be composed of three members, to be appointed by the Secretary, of whom—

(i) one shall be a representative of the Federal Government;

(ii) one shall be selected from a list of nominees provided by the United States-Israel Binational Science Foundation; and

(iii) one shall be selected from a list of nominees provided by the United States-Israel Binational Industrial Research and Development Foundation.

(6) CONTRIBUTED FUNDS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may accept or retain funds contributed by any person, government entity, or organization for purposes of carrying out this subsection. Such funds shall be available, subject to appropriation, without fiscal year limitation.

(7) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of completion of a project for which a grant is provided under this subsection, the

grant recipient shall submit to the Secretary a report that contains—

(A) a description of how the grant funds were used by the recipient; and

(B) an evaluation of the level of success of each project funded by the grant.

(8) CLASSIFICATION.—Grants shall be awarded under this subsection only for projects that are considered to be unclassified by both the United States and Israel.

(b) TERMINATION.—The grant program and the advisory board established under this section terminate on the date that is 7 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) NO ADDITIONAL FUNDS AUTHORIZED.—No additional funds are authorized to carry out the requirements of this section. Such requirements shall be carried out using amounts otherwise authorized.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term “cybersecurity research” means research, including social science research, into ways to identify, protect against, detect, respond to, and recover from cybersecurity threats;

(2) the term “cybersecurity technology” means technology intended to identify, protect against, detect, respond to, and recover from cybersecurity threats;

(3) the term “cybersecurity threat” has the meaning given such term in section 102 of the Cybersecurity Information Sharing Act of 2015 (enacted as title I of the Cybersecurity Act of 2015 (division N of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2016 (Public Law 114-113)));

(4) the term “Department” means the Department of Homeland Security; and

(5) the term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Homeland Security.

SEC. 104. REPORT ON POTENTIAL BENEFITS AND IMPACT TO THE UNITED STATES OF ESTABLISHING A JOINT UNITED STATES-ISRAEL CYBERSECURITY CENTER OF EXCELLENCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report examining the potential benefits and impact to the United States of establishing a joint United States-Israel Cybersecurity Center of Excellence based in the United States and Israel to leverage the experience, knowledge, and expertise of institutions of higher education (as such term is defined in subsection (a) or (b) of section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001)), private sector entities, and government entities in the area of cybersecurity and protection of critical infrastructure (as such term is defined in subsection (e) of section 1016 of the Critical Infrastructures Protection Act of 2001 (42 U.S.C. 5195c; enacted in title X of the USA PATRIOT Act (Public Law 20 107-56))).

(b) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate.

SEC. 105. CYBER DIPLOMACY OFFICER.

The Secretary of State is encouraged to appoint a qualified individual to assume the role of cyber diplomacy officer at the United States Embassy in Israel.

SEC. 106. UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT MEMORANDUM-ISRAEL ENHANCED COOPERATION.

(a) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It should be the policy of the United States Agency for International Development to cooperate with

Israel in order to advance common goals across a wide variety of sectors, including energy, agriculture and food security, democracy, human rights and governance, economic growth and trade, education, environment, global health and water and sanitation.

(b) MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING.—The Secretary of State, acting through the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, is authorized to enter into memoranda of understanding with Israel in order to advance common goals on energy, agriculture and food security, democracy, human rights and governance, economic growth and trade, education, environment, global health and water sanitation with a focus on strengthening mutual ties and cooperation with nations throughout the world.

SEC. 107. COOPERATIVE PROJECTS AMONG THE UNITED STATES, ISRAEL, AND DEVELOPING COUNTRIES.

Section 106(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151d) is amended to read as follows:

“(f) There are authorized to be appropriated \$2,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2024 to finance cooperative projects among the United States, Israel, and developing countries that identify and support local solutions to address sustainability challenges relating to water resources, agriculture, and energy storage, including for the following activities:

“(1) Establishing public-private partnerships.

“(2) Supporting the identification, research, development testing, and scaling of innovations that focus on populations that are vulnerable to environmental and resource-scarcity crises, such as subsistence farming communities.

“(3) Seed or transition-to-scale funding, publicity and marketing promotional support, or mentorship and partnership brokering support.

“(4) Acceleration of demonstrations or applications of local solutions to sustainability challenges, or the further refinement, testing, or implementation of innovations that have previously effectively addressed sustainability challenges.”

SEC. 108. JOINT COOPERATIVE PROGRAM RELATED TO INNOVATION AND HIGHTECH FOR THE MIDDLE EAST REGION.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the United States should help foster cooperation in the Middle East region by financing and, where appropriate, cooperating in projects related to innovation and hightech; and

(2) such projects should—

(A) contribute to development and the quality of life in the Middle East region through the application of research and technology; and

(B) contribute to Arab-Israeli cooperation by establishing strong working relationships that last beyond the life of such projects.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of State, acting through the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, is authorized to seek to establish a program between the United States, Israel, Egypt, Jordan, Morocco, Tunisia, Lebanon, and the West Bank and Gaza Strip to provide for cooperation in the Middle East region by financing and, where appropriate, cooperating in, projects related to innovation and high-tech.

(c) PROJECT REQUIREMENTS.—Each project carried out under the program established by subsection (b)—

(1) shall include participation from at least one entity of Israel and one entity of Egypt,

Jordan, Morocco, Tunisia, Lebanon, and the West Bank and Gaza Strip; and

(2) should include participation from a total of three or more such entities to the maximum extent practicable.

SEC. 109. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON EASTERN MEDITERRANEAN ENERGY COOPERATION.

It is the sense of Congress that cooperation between the United States and Israel for the purpose of research and development of energy sources would be in the national interests of not only the United States and Israel, but also of the other nations in the Eastern Mediterranean and North Africa with similar natural gas finds.

SEC. 110. COOPERATION ON OTHER MATTERS.

(a) UNITED STATES-ISRAEL ENERGY CENTER.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Energy \$4,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2020, 2021, and 2022 to carry out the activities of the United States-Israel Energy Center established pursuant to section 917(d) of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17337(d)).

(b) UNITED STATES-ISRAEL BINATIONAL INDUSTRIAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT FOUNDATION.—It is the sense of Congress that grants to promote covered energy projects conducted by or in conjunction with the United States-Israel Binational Industrial Research and Development Foundation should continue to be funded at not less than \$2,000,000 annually under section 917(b) of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17337(b)).

(c) UNITED STATES-ISRAEL COOPERATION ON ENERGY, WATER, HOMELAND SECURITY, AGRICULTURE, AND ALTERNATIVE FUEL TECHNOLOGIES.—Section 7 of the United States-Israel Strategic Partnership Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 8606) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$2,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2020, 2021, and 2022.”

(d) ANNUAL POLICY DIALOGUE.—It is the sense of Congress that the Department of Transportation and Israel’s Ministry of Transportation should engage in an annual policy dialogue to implement the 2016 Memorandum of Cooperation signed by the Secretary of Transportation and the Israeli Minister of Transportation.

(e) COOPERATION ON SPACE EXPLORATION AND SCIENCE INITIATIVES.—The Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall continue to work with the Israel Space Agency to identify and cooperatively pursue peaceful space exploration and science initiatives in areas of mutual interest, taking all appropriate measures to protect sensitive information, intellectual property, trade secrets, and economic interests of the United States.

(f) UNITED STATES-ISRAEL BINATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT FUND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1458(e)(2) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3291(e)(2)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) include food and nutrition research and development and the commercialization of the best practices identified through such research and development.”

(2) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out subparagraph (C) of section 1458(e)(2) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act

of 1977, as added by paragraph (1)(C), \$7,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2020, 2021, and 2022.

(3) REPORT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on activities of the United States-Israel Binational Agricultural Research and Development Fund under section 1458(e) of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3291(e)).

(B) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this paragraph, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(i) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives; and

(ii) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate.

(g) RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION RELATING TO DESALINATION TECHNOLOGY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on research and development cooperation with international partners, such as the State of Israel, in the area of desalination technology as required under section 9(b)(3) of the Water Desalination Act of 1996 (42 U.S.C. 10301 note).

(2) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate.

(h) RESEARCH AND TREATMENT OF POSTTRAUMATIC STRESS DISORDER.—It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Veterans Affairs should seek to explore collaboration between the Mental Illness Research, Education and Clinical Centers and Centers of Excellence and Israeli institutions with expertise in researching and treating posttraumatic stress disorder.

(i) DEVELOPMENT OF HEALTH TECHNOLOGIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Health and Human Services \$2,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2020, 2021, and 2022 to establish a bilateral cooperative program with Israel for the development of health technologies, including health technologies described in paragraph (2), with an emphasis on collaboratively advancing the use of technology, personalized medicine, and data in relation to aging.

(2) TYPES OF HEALTH TECHNOLOGIES.—The health technologies described in this paragraph may include technologies such as artificial intelligence, biofeedback, sensors, monitoring devices, and kidney care.

(j) OFFICE OF INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS OF THE FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It is the sense of Congress that the Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration should seek to explore collaboration with Israel through the Office of International Programs.

(2) REPORT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commissioner, acting through the head of the Office of International Programs, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the benefits to the

United States and to Israel of opening an office in Israel for the Office of International Programs.

(B) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this paragraph, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(i) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives; and

(ii) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate.

(k) SENSE OF CONGRESS ON UNITED STATES-ISRAEL ECONOMIC COOPERATION.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the United States-Israel economic partnership has achieved great tangible and intangible benefits to both countries and is a foundational component of the strong alliance;

(2) science and technology innovations present promising new frontiers for United States-Israel economic cooperation, particularly in light of widespread drought, cybersecurity attacks, and other major challenges impacting the United States; and

(3) the President should regularize and expand existing forums of economic dialogue with Israel and foster both public and private sector participation.

TITLE II—SECURITY ASSISTANCE FOR ISRAEL

SEC. 201. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) On September 14, 2016, the United States and Israel signed a 10-year Memorandum of Understanding reaffirming the importance of continuing annual United States military assistance to Israel and cooperative missile defense programs in a way that enhances Israel’s security and strengthens the bilateral relationship between the two countries.

(2) The 2016 Memorandum of Understanding reflected United States support of Foreign Military Financing (FMF) grant assistance to Israel over the 10-year period beginning in fiscal year 2019 and ending in fiscal year 2028. Such FMF grant assistance would equal \$3.3 billion annually, totaling \$33 billion.

(3) The 2016 Memorandum of Understanding also reflected United States support for funding for cooperative programs to develop, produce, and procure missile, rocket and projectile defense capabilities over a 10-year period beginning in fiscal year 2019 and ending in fiscal year 2028 at a level of \$500 million annually, totaling \$5 billion.

SEC. 202. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

It is the policy of the United States to provide assistance to the Government of Israel in order to help enable Israel to defend itself by itself and develop long-term capacity, primarily through the acquisition of advanced capabilities that are available from the United States.

SEC. 203. CONTINGENCY PLANS TO PROVIDE ISRAEL WITH NECESSARY DEFENSE ARTICLES AND SERVICES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President, acting through the Secretary of Defense and in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall establish and update as appropriate contingency plans to provide Israel with defense articles and services that are determined by the Secretary of Defense to be necessary for the defense of Israel.

(b) CONGRESSIONAL BRIEFING.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall brief the appropriate congressional committees on the status of the contingency plans required under subsection (a).

SEC. 204. WAIVER FOR EXISTING OR IMMINENT MILITARY THREAT TO ISRAEL.

Section 38 of the Arms Export Control Act is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(1) WAIVER FOR EXISTING OR IMMINENT MILITARY THREAT TO ISRAEL.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Upon receiving information that Israel is under an existing or imminent threat of military attack, the President may waive the requirements of this Act and direct the immediate transfer to Israel of such defense articles or services the President determines to be necessary to assist Israel in its defense against such threat. Amounts obligated or expended to carry out this paragraph shall not be subject to any limitation in law, or provision of any bilateral agreement, relating to the amount of United States assistance authorized to be made available to Israel.

“(2) NOTIFICATION REQUIRED.—As soon as practicable after a transfer of defense articles or services pursuant to the authority provided by paragraph (1), the President shall provide a notification in writing to Congress of the details of such transfer, consistent with the requirements of section 36 of this Act.”.

SEC. 205. SECURITY ASSISTANCE FOR ISRAEL.

Section 513(c) of the Security Assistance Act of 2000 (Public Law 106-280; 114 Stat. 856) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “2002 and 2003” and inserting “2020, 2021, 2022, 2023 and 2024”;

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking “equal to—” and all that follows and inserting “not less than \$3,300,000,000.”; and

(3) in paragraph (3), by striking “Funds authorized” and all that follows through “later.” and inserting “Funds authorized to be available for Israel under subsection (b)(1) and paragraph (1) of this subsection for fiscal years 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023, and 2024 shall be disbursed not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of an Act making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs for the respective fiscal year, or October 31 of the respective fiscal year, whichever is later.”.

SEC. 206. JOINT ASSESSMENT OF QUANTITY OF PRECISION GUIDED MUNITIONS FOR USE BY ISRAEL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President, acting through the Secretary of Defense and in consultation with the Secretary of State, is authorized to conduct a joint assessment with the Government of Israel with respect to the matters described in subsection (b).

(b) MATTERS DESCRIBED.—The matters described in this subsection are the following:

(1) The quantity and type of precision guided munitions that are necessary for Israel to combat Hezbollah in the event of a sustained armed confrontation between Israel and Hezbollah.

(2) The quantity and type of precision guided munitions that are necessary for Israel in the event of a sustained armed confrontation with other armed groups and terrorist organizations such as Hamas.

(3) The resources the Government of Israel can plan to dedicate to acquire such precision guided munitions.

(4) United States planning to assist Israel to prepare for the sustained armed confrontations described in paragraphs (1) and (2) as well as the ability of the United States to resupply Israel in the event of such confrontations described in paragraphs (1) and (2), if any.

(c) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 15 days after the date on which the joint assessment authorized under subsection (a) is completed, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the

appropriate congressional committees a report that contains the joint assessment.

(2) FORM.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

SEC. 207. TRANSFER OF PRECISION GUIDED MUNITIONS TO ISRAEL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 514 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2321h), the President is authorized to transfer to Israel precision guided munitions from reserve stocks for Israel in such quantities as necessary for legitimate self-defense of Israel and is otherwise consistent with the purposes and conditions for such transfers under the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2751 et seq.).

(b) CERTIFICATION.—Except in the case of an emergency as determined by the President, not later than 5 days before making a transfer under subsection (a), the President shall certify to the appropriate congressional committees that the transfer of the precision guided munitions—

(1) does not affect the ability of the United States to maintain a sufficient supply of precision guided munitions;

(2) does not harm the combat readiness of the United States or the ability of the United States to meet its commitment to allies for the transfer of such munitions;

(3) is necessary for Israel to counter the threat of rockets in a timely fashion; and

(4) is in the national security interest of the United States.

SEC. 208. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON RAPID ACQUISITION AND DEPLOYMENT PROCEDURES.

It is the sense of Congress that the President should prescribe procedures for the rapid acquisition and deployment of precision guided munitions for United States counterterrorism missions, or to assist an ally of the United States, including Israel, that is subject to direct missile threat.

SEC. 209. EXTENSION OF WAR RESERVES STOCKPILE AUTHORITY.

(a) DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2005.—Subsection (d) of section 12001 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2005 (Public Law 108-287; 118 Stat. 1011) is amended by striking “after September 30, 2020” and inserting “after September 30, 2025”.

(b) FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961.—Section 514(b)(2)(A) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2321h(b)(2)(A)) is amended by striking “2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, and 2020” and inserting “2020, 2021, 2022, 2023, 2024, and 2025”.

SEC. 210. ELIGIBILITY OF ISRAEL FOR THE STRATEGIC TRADE AUTHORIZATION EXCEPTION TO CERTAIN EXPORT CONTROL LICENSING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Israel has adopted high standards in the field of export controls.

(2) Israel has declared its unilateral adherence to the Missile Technology Control Regime, the Australia Group, and the Nuclear Suppliers Group.

(3) Israel is a party to—

(A) the Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or Other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare, signed at Geneva June 17, 1925; and

(B) the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material, adopted at Vienna on October 26, 1979.

(4) Section 6(b) of the United States-Israel Strategic Partnership Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 8603 note) directs the President, consistent with the commitments of the United States under international agreements, to take steps so that Israel may be included in the list of countries eligible for the strategic

trade authorization exception under section 740.20(c)(1) of title 15, Code of Federal Regulations, to the requirement for a license for the export, re-export, or in-country transfer of an item subject to controls under the Export Administration Regulations.

(b) REPORT ON ELIGIBILITY FOR STRATEGIC TRADE AUTHORIZATION EXCEPTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that describes the steps taken to include Israel in the list of countries eligible for the strategic trade authorization exception under section 740.20 (c) (1) of title 15, Code of Federal Regulations section, as required under 6(b) of the United States-Israel Strategic Partnership Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 8603 note).

(2) FORM.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

SEC. 211. EXTENSION OF LOAN GUARANTEES TO ISRAEL.

Chapter 5 of title I of the Emergency Wartime Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2003 (Public Law 108-11; 117 Stat. 576) is amended under the heading “Loan Guarantees to Israel”—

(1) in the matter preceding the first proviso, by striking “September 30, 2020” and inserting “September 30, 2025”; and

(2) in the second proviso, by striking “September 30, 2020” and inserting “September 30, 2025”.

SEC. 212. DEFINITION.

In this title, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate.

TITLE III—JUSTICE FOR UNITED STATES VICTIMS OF PALESTINIAN TERRORISM

SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Justice for United States Victims of Palestinian Terrorism Act”.

SEC. 302. FACILITATION OF THE SETTLEMENT OF TERRORISM-RELATED CLAIMS OF NATIONALS OF THE UNITED STATES.

(a) COMPREHENSIVE PROCESS TO FACILITATE THE RESOLUTION OF ANTI-TERRORISM ACT CLAIMS.—The Secretary of State, in consultation with the Attorney General, shall, not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, develop and initiate a comprehensive process for the Department of State to facilitate the resolution and settlement of covered claims.

(b) ELEMENTS OF COMPREHENSIVE PROCESS.—The comprehensive process developed under subsection (a) shall include, at a minimum, the following:

(1) Not later than 45 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Department of State shall publish a notice in the Federal Register identifying the method by which a national of the United States, or a representative of a national of the United States, who has a covered claim, may contact the Department of State to give notice of the covered claim.

(2) Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State, or a designee of the Secretary, shall meet (and make every effort to continue to meet on a regular basis thereafter) with any national of the United States, or a representative of a national of the United States, who has a covered claim and has informed the Department of State of the covered claim using the method established pursuant to paragraph (1) to discuss the status of the covered

claim, including the status of any settlement discussions with the Palestinian Authority or the Palestine Liberation Organization.

(3) Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State, or a designee of the Secretary, shall make every effort to meet (and make every effort to continue to meet on a regular basis thereafter) with representatives of the Palestinian Authority and the Palestine Liberation Organization to discuss the covered claims identified pursuant to paragraph (1) and potential settlement of the covered claims.

(c) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary of State shall, not later than 240 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter for 5 years, submit to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives a report describing activities that the Department of State has undertaken to comply with this section, including specific updates regarding paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (b).

(d) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) covered claims should be resolved in a manner that provides just compensation to the victims;

(2) covered claims should be resolved and settled in favor of the victim to the fullest extent possible and without subjecting victims to unnecessary or protracted litigation;

(3) the United States Government should take all practicable steps to facilitate the resolution and settlement of all covered claims, including engaging directly with the victims or their representatives and the Palestinian Authority and the Palestine Liberation Organization; and

(4) the United States Government should strongly urge the Palestinian Authority and the Palestine Liberation Organization to commit to good-faith negotiations to resolve and settle all covered claims.

(e) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “covered claim” means any pending action by, or final judgment in favor of, a national of the United States, or any action by a national of the United States dismissed for lack of personal jurisdiction, under section 2333 of title 18, United States Code, against the Palestinian Authority or the Palestine Liberation Organization.

SEC. 303. MODIFICATION TO CONSENT OF CERTAIN PARTIES TO PERSONAL JURISDICTION.

(a) AMENDMENT TO TITLE 18.—Section 2334 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking subparagraphs (A) and (B) of subsection (e)(1) and inserting the following:

“(A) beginning on the date that is 180 days after the date of enactment of this subparagraph, makes, renews, promotes, or advances any application in order to obtain the same standing as a member state in the United Nations or any specialized agency thereof, or accepts such standing, outside an agreement negotiated between Israel and the Palestinians; or

“(B) beginning on the date that is 15 days after the date of enactment of the Justice for United States Victims of Palestinian Terrorism Act—

“(i) continues to maintain any office, headquarters, premises, or other facilities or establishments in the United States; or

“(ii) establishes or procures any office, headquarters, premises, or other facilities or establishments in the United States.”; and

(2) And by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

“(3) DEFENDANT DEFINED.—For purposes of paragraph (1) of this subsection, the term ‘defendant’ means—

“(A) the Palestinian Authority;

“(B) the Palestine Liberation Organization;

“(C) any organization or other entity that is a successor to or affiliated with the Palestinian Authority or the Palestine Liberation Organization; or

“(D) any organization or other entity—

“(i) identified in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C); and

“(ii) that self-identifies as, holds itself out to be, or carries out conduct in the name of, the ‘State of Palestine’ or ‘Palestine’ in connection with official business of the United Nations.

“(4) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN ACTIVITIES AND LOCATIONS.—In determining whether a defendant shall be deemed to have consented to personal jurisdiction under paragraph (1)(B), a court may not consider—

“(A) any office, headquarters, premises or other facility or establishment used exclusively for the purpose of conducting official business of the United Nations; or

“(B) any activity undertaken exclusively for the purpose of conducting official business of the United Nations.

“(5) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Notwithstanding any other law (including any treaty), any office, headquarters, premises, or other facility or establishment within the territory of the United States that is not specifically exempted by paragraph (4)(A) shall be considered to be in the United States for purposes of clauses (i) and (ii) of paragraph (1)(B).”.

(b) PRIOR CONSENT NOT ABROGATED.—The amendments made by this section do not abrogate any consent deemed to have been given under section 2334(e) of title 18, United States Code, as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act.

TITLE IV—BUDGETARY EFFECTS

SEC. 401. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled “Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation” for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARTWRIGHT). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. RESCHENTHALER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1837.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the United States-Israel Cooperation Enhancement and Regional Security Act.

I want to start by thanking Mr. DEUTCH and Mr. WILSON for their extraordinary leadership in crafting this measure. This is another piece of bipar-

tisan legislation that underscores the vitality and bipartisanship of the U.S.-Israel relationship.

The centerpiece of this bill is a provision that writes into law the 10-year memorandum of understanding President Obama signed with Israel before he left office. The legislation also enhances U.S.-Israel cooperation on a wide range of issues, from helping veterans confront issues with PTSD, to advancing space cooperation, to developing new ways to get clean water.

In addition, the bill advances other critical priorities. It helps ensure that the families of American victims of terrorism will get their day in court, so they can finally see some justice after their loved ones were so cruelly taken from them. And it includes a legal fix that will restore U.S. assistance to Palestinians that has been cut off in recent months.

When I traveled to the West Bank in May, I saw the impacts of this funding cut firsthand. I visited a water treatment system in Jericho that is ready to go into place, already paid for by the United States but, because of legislation Congress passed last year, they can't take the tiny extra step needed to get it up and running.

We also met with people seeking to enhance tolerance and understanding between Palestinians and Israelis, exactly the sort of peace-building efforts we should be supporting, unlike the BDS movement. These have all had to stop work due to the assistance cut.

In addition, I met with American military officials who are deeply concerned about the suspension of security assistance to the Palestinians and the implications of that for Israel's security. So I am pleased that the legislation before us today provides a fix for this unsustainable situation.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD two pieces that argue that we must restore this assistance now.

[From The Hill, Jan. 28, 2019]

CONGRESS MUST MOVE QUICKLY TO FIX THE ANTI-TERRORISM CLARIFICATION ACT

(By Debra Shushan)

In a perversely ironic turn, a law intended to aid American victims of international terrorist attacks will strike a serious blow to counterterrorism cooperation that keeps Israelis (and Americans visiting Israel) safe.

The Anti-Terrorism Clarification Act (ATCA) will take effect on February 1. Unless it is adequately amended or repealed before then, the law will damage Israeli national security and U.S. foreign policy toward the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Time is short, and Congress must take action.

ATCA was passed with little fanfare, by unanimous consent in the House and Senate, and apparently absent an understanding of its foreign policy implications. The law's aim is to assist American victims of international terrorism in securing, through U.S. courts, monetary damages from entities alleged to have aided and abetted terrorist attacks.

It was the outcome of lawsuits against the Palestinian Authority and Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), like Waldman v. PLO, that drove the most consequential provision in ATCA. In Waldman, a district court

awarded the plaintiff \$655.5 million (triple the damages suffered), only to have a circuit court rule on appeal that the court lacked personal jurisdiction over the PLO. To address this perceived flaw, Section 4 of ATCA stipulates that a defendant consents to personal jurisdiction if it accepts the types of aid the U.S. government has given the PA: most importantly, economic support funds (ESF) and international narcotics control and law enforcement (INCLE) aid.

Recognizing that future acceptance of U.S. assistance could bankrupt the Palestinian Authority through litigation, Palestinian Prime Minister Rami Hamdallah informed Secretary of State Mike Pompeo that the Palestinian Authority will decline U.S. aid when ATCA takes effect. Comparing the \$665 million judgement in Waldman (equivalent to 13 percent of the Palestinian Authority's 2018 budget) to \$60 million in security funding it receives from the U.S., its decision was obviously inevitable.

So, ATCA will not achieve its purpose of enabling terror victims to collect money from the Palestinian Authority or PLO through litigation. Since the Palestinian Authority has foresworn U.S. aid, courts still won't have personal jurisdiction over it.

Meanwhile, ATCA will harm Israeli security, given an end to INCLE funding for the Palestinian Authority and the termination of the U.S. Security Coordinator. Under U.S. supervision since 2005, the Palestinian Authority Security Forces (PASF) have transformed into a professional and effective entity that works closely with Israel to maintain law and order in Palestinian cities and foil terrorism. Israeli security chiefs are unequivocal about the importance of this security coordination. In remarks, to the Israeli cabinet earlier this month, outgoing Israeli army chief of staff Lt. Gen. Gadi Eisenkot urged the government to strengthen the PASF. Belatedly, the Israeli government has weighed in with the Trump administration, asking for an ATCA fix to preserve security coordination, “a top priority Israeli national security interest.”

ATCA will also undermine U.S. foreign policy vis-à-vis the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Neither President Trump nor subsequent presidents will be able to use aid as a tool to facilitate future Palestinian-Israeli peace. Meanwhile, as the U.S. Agency for International Development prepares to lay off local staff and abandon nearly completed infrastructure projects in the West Bank, the Palestinian people will suffer. American interests are harmed, too, when worsening Palestinian quality of life fosters extremism and a hardening of attitudes toward the U.S. and Israel.

Compounding its deleterious impact, ATCA may apply to foreign states, impacting allies in the Middle East (think of Egypt and Jordan) and beyond. It could also apply to humanitarian NGOs.

Members of Congress are working with the Trump administration on a fix. A number of options are available. The best choice is revocation of Section 4, which triggered this crisis while failing to help terrorist attack victims. A national security waiver for the President is another possibility. It is sub-optimal since President Trump slashed ESF funding to Palestinians before ATCA and appears unlikely to reinstate it, though a future president could. Exempting only INCLE funding is better than nothing, but would transmit the message to Palestinians that the U.S. cares only about Israeli security and not their welfare. (They are complementary; we must care about both.)

If Congress cannot engineer a fix by January 31—a real danger, even likelihood—Congress must at minimum delay ATCA's implementation. This time bomb is ticking, and if

Congress can't defuse ATCA in time, it must at least reset the clock.

[From NPR, Jan. 31, 2019]

OPINION: HERE'S WHY U.S. AID TO PALESTINIANS NEEDS TO CONTINUE

(By Dana Stroul, Daniel B. Shapiro)

Is U.S. assistance to the Palestinians an indulgence we can do without? Will its elimination leave Israelis, Palestinians and U.S. interests better off? Unless Congress and the Trump administration act quickly, we are about to find out.

Since 1993, the United States has provided more than \$5 billion in assistance to the West Bank and Gaza. This generous program continued across Republican and Democratic administrations, with bipartisan Congressional support, despite ups and downs in the peace process, spikes and drops in violence and frustrations in Washington and Jerusalem with Palestinian leaders.

But the whole enterprise is now in jeopardy.

First, the Trump Administration cut the entire fiscal year 2017 economic aid program for the West Bank and Gaza and looks likely to do the same for fiscal 2018. Now the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) mission, with no money to spend, is on the verge of closing down, leaving ongoing projects uncompleted.

Next, the Anti-Terrorism Clarification Act, which exposes the Palestinian Authority to legal action in U.S. courts if it accepts any U.S. assistance funds, comes into force on Feb. 1.

The ATCA's passage last year prompted Palestinian Authority Prime Minister Rami Hamdallah (who resigned Tuesday) to inform Secretary of State Mike Pompeo in a late-December letter that the Palestinian Authority will no longer accept any U.S. assistance. If carried out, that will end U.S. assistance for the Palestinian Authority Security Forces, the deliberately under-the-radar and largely successful U.S. effort to develop these forces and facilitate effective security coordination with Israel in the West Bank.

It will also eliminate the role of the U.S. security coordinator, a three-star general who oversees the training of the security forces and serves as a liaison between Israeli and Palestinian security officials.

Thus far, there has been minimal debate in Washington over the implications of these developments on stability in the West Bank and Gaza and the inextricable link to Israel's security. Nor has there been a sober reckoning of the very real implications for U.S. influence.

It's easy to be cavalier about these programs, considering the moribund peace process, Palestinian leaders who lack legitimacy with much of the U.S. public, and bouts of violence. But members of Congress, including many of Israel's strongest supporters on both sides of the aisle, have long understood their value.

While oversight has been rigorous, funding for Palestinian assistance programs has always flowed with bipartisan support because it was determined to reinforce Israel's security and provide a measure of U.S. leverage and influence.

This logic was ratified by the support of the Israeli government for these programs. Israeli authorities understood that a breakdown in security, an economic collapse or a humanitarian crisis in the West Bank would place an enormous burden on Israel. A crisis in the West Bank could require the Israel Defense Forces to redeploy personnel from other high-risk areas like the Lebanon border or the Golan Heights.

Moreover, U.S. assistance has sustained lines of contact with Palestinian officials. During flare-ups and crises, this connective tissue has placed the U.S. in a position to defuse situations when direct Israeli-Palestinian engagement was too difficult. U.S. Security Coordinator Lt. Gen. Eric Wendt and his predecessors have at times been the only American officials able to bridge both sides in moments of high tension.

The current funding crisis runs contrary to clearly expressed Congressional intent. Last year, large bipartisan majorities passed the Taylor Force Act, which, by withholding some U.S. aid, aimed to compel the Palestinian Authority to end, among other things, its practice of providing payments to families of convicted Palestinian terrorists. But Congress also voted resoundingly to maintain key elements of assistance, including humanitarian aid, people-to-people programs, medical services and other programming with no direct connection to the Palestinian Authority.

The Israeli government, for its part, was clear in its support for the Taylor Force Act's intent of ending U.S. assistance that could even indirectly subsidize the Palestinian Authority's payments to terrorists' families. But there was never Israeli support for curtailing the accounts Congress protected programs acknowledged to maintain a modicum of stability in the West Bank and prevent a full-scale humanitarian crisis in either the West Bank or Gaza.

In other words, the Taylor Force Act's passage underscored bipartisan Congressional support for continuing U.S. assistance to the Palestinians. Trump officials, who took an axe to the entire program, citing the Taylor Force Act, have misinterpreted the meaning of the law.

The Israeli national security establishment remains painfully aware that it will face the burden—financial, security, and otherwise—of addressing a full-scale collapse in the West Bank or Gaza if the U.S. steps away or loses all influence and credibility with the Palestinians. And if they lose cooperation with the Palestinian security forces, Israeli security forces will find themselves in the far worse position of needing to directly intervene to confront security threats in Palestinian-populated areas, rather than working through the U.S.-funded multilateral construct.

If all parties remain stuck on the current course, the biggest losers will be innocent Palestinian civilians and Israel. The winners are those benefiting from instability and the opportunity to point to the U.S. as unreliable and in retreat from the Middle East: Hamas, other assorted terrorists and Iran.

To reverse the current course, here are some steps that the administration and Congress should urgently undertake:

FIX THE ANTI-TERRORISM CLARIFICATION ACT

A straightforward legislative fix is low-hanging fruit. Congressional and administration staff recognize that ending U.S. security assistance to the Palestinian security forces only helps adversaries and empowers enemies. In recent days, Israel belatedly added its voice, making clear it wants U.S. aid to the PASF to continue. In fact, Congress and the administration should go further and seize the opportunity in this crisis to permanently protect U.S. security assistance to the Palestinian security forces.

MITIGATE DAMAGE

Walking away from ongoing USAID projects in the West Bank and Gaza—unfinished roads, incomplete water projects, and piecemeal humanitarian and education pro-

grams—is a total waste of U.S. taxpayer dollars. Such visible reminders of U.S. abandonment will also inflame local sentiment against the United States. Congress should authorize and explicitly appropriate funds to complete these projects, following a thorough review of the status of U.S. programs in the West Bank and Gaza.

PASS POSITIVE LEGISLATIVE ALTERNATIVES

Even if traditional assistance programs remain blocked, there are creative legislative proposals that preserve space for U.S. influence and enjoy bipartisan support. The Palestinian Partnership Fund Act, introduced in the last Congress, promotes economic development by connecting Palestinian entrepreneurs and companies with counterparts in the U.S., Israel, and the Middle East. An International Fund for Israeli-Palestinian Peace, long advocated by the nonpartisan Alliance for Middle East Peace, has enjoyed bipartisan support in past Congresses and would promote people-to-people peace-building activities by pooling funding from government and private sources. Now is the time for Congress to approve funding for it.

URGE ISRAELI CLARIFICATION ON U.S. ASSISTANCE

Members of Congress naturally seek Israel's views on the security and economic consequences of completely shutting down U.S. assistance programs to the Palestinians. But during the Trump administration, the answers have been murky. After Israel's election in April, Congress should urgently seek a clear picture of the new government's views, as members continue to vote on this much-debated set of issues.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, this is a strong bipartisan bill that advances the U.S.-Israel relationship. I, again, want to thank Representatives DEUTCH and WILSON for their leadership, as well as all the other Members who contributed to this fine piece of legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,

Washington, DC, July 18, 2019.

Hon. PETER A. DEFAZIO,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN DEFAZIO: I write in reply to your letter regarding H.R. 1837, the United States-Israel Cooperation Enhancement and Regional Security Act. I appreciate your willingness to work cooperatively on this legislation.

I acknowledge that provisions of the bill fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and that your Committee will forgo action on H.R. 1837 to expedite floor consideration. I further agree that your Committee's inaction regarding the bill will not waive any future jurisdictional claims over matters addressed in H.R. 1837 which fall within your Committee's Rule X jurisdiction. I will also support the appointment of Committee of Transportation and Infrastructure conferees during any House-Senate conference convened on this legislation.

Lastly, I will ensure that our exchange of letters is include in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. Thank you again for your cooperation regarding the legislation. I look forward to continuing to work with you as the measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

ELIOT L. ENGEL,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND
INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REP-
RESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, July 17, 2019.

Hon. ELIOT ENGEL,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. ENGEL: I write concerning H.R. 1837, the United States-Israel Cooperation Enhancement and Regional Security Act. There are certain provisions in this legislation that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

In order to expedite floor consideration of H.R. 1837, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure agrees to forgo action on the bill. However, this is conditional on our mutual understanding that forgoing consideration of the bill would not prejudice the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation that fall within the Committee's Rule X jurisdiction. I also request that you urge the Speaker to name members of this Committee to any conference committee which is named to consider such provisions.

Please place a copy of this letter and your response acknowledging our jurisdictional interest into the committee report on H.R. 1837, and into the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House floor.

Sincerely,

PETER A. DEFAZIO,
Chair.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, July 19, 2019.

Hon. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON,
Chairwoman, Committee on Science, Space and
Technology, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRWOMAN JOHNSON: I am writing to you concerning H.R. 1837, the United States-Israel Cooperation Enhancement and Regional Security Act. I appreciate your willingness to work cooperatively on this legislation.

I acknowledge that provisions of the bill fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Science, Space and Technology under House Rule X and that your Committee will forgo action on H.R. 1837 to expedite floor consideration. I further acknowledge that the inaction of your Committee with respect to the bill does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over the matters contained in the bill that fall within your jurisdiction. I will also support the appointment of Committee on Science, Space and Technology conferees during any House-Senate conference convened on this legislation.

Lastly, I will ensure that our exchange of letters is included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. Thank you again for your cooperation regarding the legislation. I look forward to continuing to work with you as the measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

ELIOT L. ENGEL,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COM-
MITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND
TECHNOLOGY,
Washington, DC, July 19, 2019.

Chairman ELIOT ENGEL,
Committee on Foreign Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ENGEL: I am writing to you concerning H.R. 1837, the "United States-Israel Cooperation Enhancement and Regional Security Act," which was sequen-

tially referred to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology ("Science Committee") on March 21, 2019.

I agree to work cooperatively on this bill and the Science Committee will forgo action on H.R. 1837, in order to expedite floor consideration. This is, however, not a waiver of future jurisdictional claims by the Science Committee over this subject matter.

Thank you for agreeing to include our exchange of letters in the Congressional Record. Additionally, thank you for agreeing to support the appointment of Science Committee conferees during any House-Senate conference convened on this legislation.

Sincerely,

EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON,
Chairwoman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, July 19, 2019.

Hon. COLLIN C. PETERSON,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN PETERSON: I am writing to you concerning H.R. 1837, the United States-Israel Cooperation Enhancement and Regional Security Act. I appreciate your willingness to work cooperatively on this legislation.

I acknowledge that provisions of the bill fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture under House Rule X, and that your Committee will forgo action on H.R. 1837 to expedite floor consideration. I further acknowledge that the inaction of your Committee with respect to the bill does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over the matters contained in the bill that fall within your jurisdiction. I will also support the appointment of Committee on Agriculture conferees during any House-Senate conference convened on this legislation.

Lastly, I will ensure that our exchange of letters is included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. Thank you again for your cooperation regarding the legislation. I look forward to continuing to work with you as the measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

ELIOT L. ENGEL,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, DC, July 22, 2019.

Hon. ELIOT L. ENGEL,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ENGEL: Thank you for the opportunity to review the relevant provisions of H.R. 1837, the United States-Israel Cooperation Enhancement and Regional Security Act. While the bill was primarily referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Agriculture Committee received an additional referral.

I recognize and appreciate your desire to bring this legislation before the House in an expeditious manner, and accordingly, I agree to discharge H.R. 1837 from further consideration by the Committee on Agriculture. I do so with the understanding that by discharging the bill, the Committee on Agriculture does not waive any future jurisdictional claim on this or similar matters. Further, the Committee on Agriculture reserves the right to seek the appointment of conferees, if it should be necessary.

I ask that you inset a copy of our exchange of letters into both the Congressional Record and the Committee Report during consideration of this measure on the House floor.

Thank you for your courtesy in this matter. I look forward to continued cooperation between our respective committees.

Sincerely,

COLLIN C. PETERSON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, July 19, 2019.

Hon. FRANK PALLONE, JR.,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN PALLONE: I am writing to you concerning H.R. 1837, the United States-Israel Cooperation Enhancement and Regional Security Act. I appreciate your willingness to work cooperatively on this legislation.

I acknowledge that provisions of the bill fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Energy and Commerce under Rule X, and that your Committee will forgo action on H.R. 1837 to expedite floor consideration. I further acknowledge that the inaction of your Committee with respect to the bill does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over the matters contained in the bill that fall within your jurisdiction. I will also support the appointment of Committee on Energy and Commerce conferees during any House-Senate conference convened on this legislation.

Lastly, I will ensure that our exchange of letters is included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. Thank you again for your cooperation regarding the legislation. I look forward to continuing to work with you as the measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

ELIOT L. ENGEL,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, July 19, 2019.

Hon. ELIOT ENGEL,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ENGEL: I am writing to you concerning H.R. 1837, the United States-Israel Cooperation Enhancement and Regional Security Act, as amended, which was additionally referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

In recognition of the desire to expedite consideration of H.R. 1837, the Committee on Energy and Commerce agrees to waive formal consideration of the bill as to provisions that fall within the rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. The Committee takes this action with the mutual understanding that we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that the Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as this bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues within our jurisdiction. I also request that you support my request to name members of the Committee on Energy and Commerce to any conference committee to consider such provisions.

Finally, I would appreciate the inclusion of this letter in the report on the bill and into the Congressional Record during floor consideration of H.R. 1837.

Sincerely,

FRANK PALLONE, JR.,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, July 19, 2019.

Hon. JERROLD NADLER,

*Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN NADLER: I am writing to you concerning H.R. 1837, the United States-Israel Cooperation Enhancement and Regional Security Act. I appreciate your willingness to work cooperatively on this legislation.

I acknowledge that provisions of the bill fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary under House Rule X, and that your Committee will forgo action on H.R. 1837 to expedite floor consideration. I further acknowledge that the inaction of your Committee with respect to the bill does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over the matters contained in the bill that fall within your jurisdiction. I will also support the appointment of Committee on the Judiciary conferees during any House-Senate conference convened on this legislation.

Lastly, I will ensure that our exchange of letters is included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. Thank you again for your cooperation regarding the legislation. I look forward to continuing to work with you as the measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

ELIOT L. ENGEL,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, July 19, 2019.

Hon. ELIOT ENGEL,

*Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN ENGEL: This is to advise you that the Committee on the Judiciary has now had an opportunity to review the provisions in H.R. 1837, the "United States-Israel Cooperation Enhancement and Regional Security Act," that fall within our Rule X jurisdiction. I appreciate your consulting with us on those provisions. The Judiciary Committee has no objection to your including them in the bill for consideration on the House floor, and to expedite that consideration is willing to forgo action on H.R. 1837, with the understanding that we do not thereby waive any future jurisdictional claim over those provisions or their subject matters.

In the event a House-Senate conference on this or similar legislation is convened, the Judiciary Committee reserves the right to request an appropriate number of conferees to address any concerns with these or similar provisions that may arise in conference.

Please place this letter into the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House floor. Thank you for the cooperative spirit in which you have worked regarding this matter and others between our committees.

Sincerely,

JERROLD NADLER,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, July 19, 2019.

Hon. MARK TAKANO,

*Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN TAKANO: I am writing to you concerning H.R. 1837, the United States-Israel Cooperation Enhancement and Regional Security Act. I appreciate your willingness to work cooperatively on this legislation.

I acknowledge that provisions of the bill fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee

on Veterans' Affairs under House Rule X, and that your Committee will forgo action on H.R. 1837 to expedite floor consideration. I further acknowledge that the inaction of your Committee with respect to the bill does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over the matters contained in the bill that fall within your jurisdiction. I will also support the appointment of Committee on Veterans' Affairs conferees during any House-Senate conference convened on this legislation.

Lastly, I will ensure that our exchange of letters is included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. Thank you again for your cooperation regarding the legislation. I look forward to continuing to work with you as the measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

ELIOT L. ENGEL,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, July 22, 2019.

Hon. ELIOT L. ENGEL,

*Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. ENGEL: I am writing to you concerning H.R. 1837, the United States-Israel Cooperation Enhancement and Regional Security Act. As a result of your having consulted with us on provisions within H.R. 1837 that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I forego further consideration of this bill so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration.

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs takes this action with our mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 1837 at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over subject matter contained in this or similar legislation and that our committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as this bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues in our jurisdiction. Further, I request your support for the appointment of conferees from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs during any House-Senate conference convened on this or related legislation.

Please place this letter into the committee report on H.R. 1837 and into the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House floor to memorialize our understanding. Thank you for the cooperative spirit in which you have worked regarding this matter and others between our respective committees.

Sincerely,

MARK TAKANO,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, July 19, 2019.

Hon. BENNIE G. THOMPSON,

*Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: I am writing to you concerning H.R. 1837, the United States-Israel Cooperation Enhancement and Regional Security Act. I appreciate your willingness to work cooperatively on this legislation.

I acknowledge that provisions of the bill fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Homeland Security under House Rule X, and that your Committee will forgo action on H.R. 1837 to expedite floor consideration. I further acknowledge that the inaction of your Committee with respect to the bill does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over the matters contained in the bill that fall within your jurisdiction. I will also support the appointment of Committee on

Homeland Security conferees during any House-Senate conference convened on this legislation.

Lastly, I will ensure that our exchange of letters is included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. Thank you again for your cooperation regarding the legislation. I look forward to continuing to work with you as the measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

ELIOT L. ENGEL,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 22, 2019.

Hon. ELIOT L. ENGEL,

*Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN ENGEL: I write to you regarding H.R. 1837, the "United States-Israel Cooperation Enhancement and Regional Security Act."

H.R. 1837 contains provisions that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Homeland Security. I recognize and appreciate your desire to bring this legislation before the House in an expeditious manner and, accordingly, I will not seek a sequential referral of the bill. However, agreeing to waive consideration of this bill should not be construed as the Committee on Homeland Security waiving, altering, or otherwise affecting its jurisdiction over subject matters contained in the bill which fall within its Rule X jurisdiction.

Further, I request your support for the appointment of Homeland Security conferees during any House-Senate conference convened on this or similar legislation. I also ask that a copy of this letter and your response be included in the legislative report on H.R. 1837 and in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of this bill.

I look forward to working with you as we prepare to pass this important legislation.

Sincerely,

BENNIE G. THOMPSON,
Chairman.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1837, the United States-Israel Cooperation Enhancement and Regional Security Act, of which I am a cosponsor.

The United States-Israel partnership is a two-way street. We work together to further our shared values and interests. We already collaborate on a wide range of civil issues, such as energy and agriculture; and our security cooperation helps keep both of our countries safe as we counter threats from a wide range of terrorist groups, as well as from Iran. But still there is much more that we can do together.

I want to thank Mr. DEUTCH and Mr. WILSON for this comprehensive, bipartisan update to the United States-Israel partnership to confront the challenges both countries face in 2019 and beyond.

H.R. 1837 expands our mutually-beneficial cooperation, identifying several new or growing areas of cooperation where we can exchange innovations and help improve the lives and livelihoods of our people as well as our respective national interests.

Through this bill, the United States and Israel will be better-positioned to

cooperate on critical fields like research and development, directed energy, cybersecurity, international development and foreign assistance, treating post-traumatic stress disorder, and developing health technologies.

In terms of our security partnership with Israel, the bill authorizes U.S. foreign military financing to Israel at \$3.3 billion per year through 2024, the same levels agreed to in the 2016 U.S.-Israel memorandum. It reauthorizes United States loan guarantees and extends War Reserves Stockpile Authority for Israel.

H.R. 1837 also codifies policies to ensure that the United States can transfer precision-guided munitions and other defense articles to Israel quickly in the event of an emergency.

We all know that Israel faces threats on multiple fronts, from Iran, from Hezbollah, Hamas, and others. These adversaries aren't going to call ahead in the event of an escalation. We need to be prepared with the appropriate authorities to ensure that if Israel is facing a protracted or multifront conflict, that the United States can help.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), my good friend, and I would ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to control that time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend for yielding. I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to offer my strong support for H.R. 1837, the U.S.-Israel Cooperation Enhancement and Regional Security Act, supported and introduced by Mr. DEUTCH and Mr. WILSON. I thank them for their leadership, as well as ELIOT ENGEL and MICHAEL MCCAUL, our ranking member.

Israel is by far our closest ally in the Middle East with which we share common values, including a commitment to democracy and to the rule of law.

Sadly, Israel often comes under attack, at the United Nations and in the region, both by words and by bullets. Israel is judged by a double standard by which real or imagined flaws are magnified, while Israel's virtues as a robust democracy are ignored.

Mr. Speaker, we must stand with Israel, and this bill is a means to achieve that. Among other things, it would authorize—and this is the core of the bill—it would authorize military financing for Israel at \$3.3 billion per year, over 10 years, and enhanced cooperation with our key ally in a host of other areas from cybersecurity, to agriculture, to assisting veterans.

It is mutually beneficial, allowing us to access Israel's knowledge and to benefit from its leadership in sectors such as desalination technology, which has helped make the desert bloom, one of the most visually-evi-

dent ways Israel has positively impacted the land.

The bill encourages energy cooperation in the Eastern Mediterranean which, presumably, includes ongoing ventures with friendly countries, such as Greece and Cyprus. In short, the bill greatly enhances the mutually-beneficial ties which exist between our two great nations.

This is a good piece of legislation. It is bipartisan, and I strongly urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH), a valuable member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, author of this important bill, and chairman of the Middle East, North Africa, and International Terrorism Subcommittee.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman ENGEL for yielding the time.

I rise today in support of H.R. 1837, the U.S.-Israel Cooperation Enhancement and Regional Security Act.

I thank Chairman ENGEL for his support of this legislation, as well as Ranking Member MCCAUL, and I am especially grateful to my friend, Congressman JOE WILSON, for introducing this bill with me. I also thank the 289 bipartisan cosponsors of this bill.

Today, we send a clear message that bipartisan support for the U.S.-Israel relationship, for the security and civilian cooperation between our countries, and for the ties between the American and Israeli people, remains strong and unwavering.

Today, we vote to strengthen and enhance this relationship, while also providing victims of terrorism a rightful path to justice and restoring much-needed assistance which contributes to security and saves the lives of Israelis and Palestinians.

The security provisions in this bill reinforces the ways in which the U.S. guarantees Israel's right and ability to defend herself against any and all threats, in turn, contributing to our own national security interests in the region.

By codifying the 2016 10-year memorandum of understanding, we advance security and stability in a volatile region. But just as our alliance with Israel is about more than just security, this bill is about more than just security as well.

Our bond with Israel is rooted in our shared values. Just like this country, Israel is a vibrant democracy where political parties from right to left vigorously debate and disagree on politics and policy.

This bill enhances nonsecurity cooperation between our two nations; cooperation that has yielded impactful and tangible results around the globe in areas like energy, and water, cybersecurity, health, and agriculture.

It authorizes the United States and Israel to work together on humanitarian and development programs in

developing countries; and it expands the work that Israel, the Palestinians, and other Arab states can do together to promote scientific and technological advancement and contribute to lasting regional stability.

And finally, this legislation provides a long-awaited path to justice for victims of Palestinian terrorism.

Last year, Congress passed the Anti-Terrorism Clarification Act, which was meant to do just that. Unfortunately, that legislation has not yielded the intended results and, instead, created unintended foreign policy consequences.

As a result, the Palestinian Authority refused to accept any U.S. assistance to the West Bank in Gaza, halting humanitarian programs run by international NGOs, and even our own USAID programming could not continue. The very real impact of these cuts has been felt on the ground.

I recently led a bipartisan group of Members to visit a hospital in East Jerusalem that provides some of the only cancer treatments to Palestinians in the West Bank. That hospital has lost 25 percent of its funding.

Also affected was U.S. funding for the training of Palestinian Security Forces. These forces cooperate with the Israeli Defense Forces to keep Israelis and Palestinians safe. This program, run by a U.S. General, saves Palestinian lives and Israeli lives, and it is currently not receiving funding.

Mr. Speaker, we have a moral obligation to ensure that Americans injured or, even worse, killed by terrorism have a right to seek justice in our courts. We have a moral obligation, as well, to provide lifesaving assistance for those in need. And while this bill represents a compromise, I believe it will achieve both of these goals.

Today, we cast a vote to expand relations with one of our closest allies; a relationship that is broad and deep; that highlights the positive impact the United States and Israel can have in so many critical areas when we work together; when we harness our mutual appreciation for science and education and technology; and when we work to advance security in the region.

We do all of these because we know that whatever the politics and personalities, we are stronger as a Nation when we stand together with our ally, Israel, in support of security, peace, and democracy.

I urge my colleagues to stand with me today and to support this good piece of legislation.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Puerto Rico (Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN).

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico. Mr. Speaker, I think this is a very important bill, and I am proud to support H.R. 1837, the United States-Israel Cooperation Enhancement and Regional Security Act, that will make our bilateral security and economic cooperation stronger and more stable than ever before.

On September 14 of 2016, the U.S. and Israel signed a memorandum of understanding ensuring \$33 billion of military and strategic support over a 10-year period.

□ 1630

It reaffirmed the importance of continuing annual U.S. military assistance to Israel, our cooperative missile defense programs, in addition to other shared economic and technology interests.

The bill before us codifies that assistance for the next 10 years, while providing us with the flexibility to increase that support should Israel be under an imminent threat of a military attack.

It strengthens Israel's qualitative military edge and advances our collaboration on a range of issues, such as cybersecurity and space exploration, as well as authorizing \$12 million for the U.S.-Israel Energy Center and, through USAID, advances our common goals of promoting agriculture, education, and trade with other countries around the world.

As our strongest and most capable ally in a turbulent region, Israel is an essential U.S. strategic partner.

Israel is also a target for hostile actors who call for her destruction. Just 2 months ago, the Palestinian Islamic Jihad and Hamas terrorist groups launched over 600 rockets and mortars at Israeli civilian targets, killing four and wounding eight. May was Israel's deadliest month in almost 2 years.

In addition to the threat coming from these terrorist groups, Israel faces a threat of a resurgent Iran, whose militias and proxies, from Iraq to Syria to Lebanon, continue to grow in numbers, weapons, and strength.

Just recently, Chairman DEUTCH and I heard firsthand from Prime Minister Netanyahu some of these complex and serious existential challenges that seek to undermine our strategic ally.

Mr. Speaker, it is now more important than ever that the United States stand with the democratic Jewish State of Israel and what she represents, which is freedom, democracy, and equality in that region. For that, I encourage my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to close.

I want to, first of all, thank the gentlewoman from Puerto Rico (Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN) for her very eloquent statement and for her deep concern for the State of Israel. I thank her for that leadership.

I would also like to thank, in closing, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. WILSON, Chairman ENGEL, Ranking Member MCCAUL, and the Foreign Affairs Committee membership for their bipartisan work, and the staff, to ensure that the United States and Israel can work together to respond to shared challenges.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER).

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1837, the United States-Israel Cooperation Enhancement and Regional Security Act.

Israel is our greatest ally in the Middle East, and we work jointly in a number of strategic areas. This bill strengthens our partnership and expands important economic, scientific, and security cooperation between the United States and Israel.

This bill also encourages the United States to designate a new coordinator of U.S.-Israel research and development and establishes a grant program on cybersecurity development. It authorizes R&D on issues, including post-traumatic stress disorder, agriculture, and the development of health technologies, as well as vital security assistance in accordance with the 2016 MOU.

It also provides an important fix that ensures a path to justice for American victims of terrorism and retains our ability to provide vital assistance that promotes security and stability for both Israelis and Palestinians.

I would like to thank my colleagues, Mr. DEUTCH and Mr. WILSON, for their leadership on this important bipartisan bill.

I urge all my colleagues to vote on this bill.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume for the purpose of closing.

The United States-Israel Cooperation Enhancement and Regional Security Act is an excellent bipartisan bill designed to further strengthen the relationship between Israel and the United States, give American victims their day in court, and restore assistance to the Palestinians.

I strongly support this bill. I urge all Members to join me in doing so. Again, this is a bipartisan bill showing, again, the strong support that the United States and Israel have for each other.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1837, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PALESTINIAN INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM SUPPORT PREVENTION ACT OF 2019

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1850) to impose sanctions with respect to foreign support for Palestinian terrorism, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1850

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Palestinian International Terrorism Support Prevention Act of 2019".

SEC. 2. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

It shall be the policy of the United States—

(1) to prevent Hamas, the Palestinian Islamic Jihad, or any affiliate or successor thereof from accessing its international support networks; and

(2) to oppose Hamas, the Palestinian Islamic Jihad, or any affiliate or successor thereof from attempting to use goods, including medicine and dual use items, to smuggle weapons and other materials to further acts of terrorism.

SEC. 3. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO FOREIGN PERSONS AND AGENCIES AND INSTRUMENTALITIES OF FOREIGN STATES SUPPORTING HAMAS, THE PALESTINIAN ISLAMIC JIHAD, OR ANY AFFILIATE OR SUCCESSOR THEREOF.

(a) IDENTIFICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter for a period not to exceed 3 years, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that identifies each foreign person or agency or instrumentality of a foreign state that the President determines—

(A) knowingly assists in, sponsors, or provides significant financial or material support for, or financial or other services to or in support of, the terrorist activities of any person described in paragraph (2); or

(B) directly or indirectly, knowingly and materially engaged in a significant transaction with any person described in paragraph (2).

(2) PERSON DESCRIBED.—A person described in this paragraph is a foreign person that the President determines—

(A) is a senior member of Hamas, the Palestinian Islamic Jihad, or any affiliate or successor thereof;

(B) is a senior member of a foreign terrorist organization designated pursuant to section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189) whose members directly or indirectly support the terrorist activities of Hamas, the Palestinian Islamic Jihad, or any affiliate or successor thereof by knowingly engaging in a significant transaction with, or providing financial or material support for Hamas, the Palestinian Islamic Jihad, or any affiliate or successor thereof, or any person described in subparagraph (A); or

(C) directly or indirectly, supports the terrorist activities of Hamas, the Palestinian Islamic Jihad, or any affiliate or successor thereof by knowingly and materially assisting, sponsoring, or providing financial or material support for, or goods or services to or in support of, Hamas, the Palestinian Islamic Jihad, or any affiliate or successor thereof, or any person described in subparagraph (A) or (B).

(3) FORM OF REPORT.—Each report required under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

(4) EXCEPTION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The President shall not be required to identify a foreign person or an agency or instrumentality of a foreign state in a report pursuant to paragraph (1)(B) if—

(i) the foreign person or agency or instrumentality of a foreign state notifies the

United States Government in advance that it proposes to engage in a significant transaction as described in paragraph (1)(B); and

(ii) the President determines and notifies the appropriate congressional committees in a classified form not less than 15 days prior to the foreign person or agency or instrumentality of a foreign state engaging in the significant transaction that the significant transaction is in the national interests of the United States.

(B) NON-APPLICABILITY.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply with respect to—

(i) an agency or instrumentality of a foreign state which the Secretary of State determines has repeatedly provided support for acts of international terrorism pursuant to section 1754(c) of the Export Reform Control Act of 2018, section 40 of the Arms Export Control Act, section 620A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, or any other provision of law; or

(ii) any significant transaction described in paragraph (1)(B) that involves, directly or indirectly, a foreign state described in clause (i).

(b) IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall impose two or more of the sanctions described in paragraph (2) with respect to a foreign person or an agency or instrumentality of a foreign state identified pursuant to subsection (a).

(2) SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.—The sanctions referred to in paragraph (1) are the following:

(A) The President may direct the Export-Import Bank of the United States not to give approval to the issuance of any guarantee, insurance, extension of credit, or participation in the extension of credit in connection with the export of any goods or services to the foreign person or agency or instrumentality of the foreign state, and the Export-Import Bank of the United States shall comply with any such direction.

(B) No sales of any defense articles, defense services, or design and construction services under the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2751 et seq.) may be made to the foreign person or agency or instrumentality of the foreign state.

(C) No licenses for export of any item on the United States Munitions List that include the foreign person or agency or instrumentality of the foreign state as a party to the license may be granted.

(D) No exports may be permitted to the foreign person or agency or instrumentality of the foreign state of any goods or technologies controlled for national security reasons under the Export Administration Regulations, except that such prohibition shall not apply to any transaction subject to the reporting requirements of title V of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 413 et seq.; relating to congressional oversight of intelligence activities).

(E) The President shall prohibit any United States financial institution from making loans or providing any credit or financing totaling more than \$10,000,000 to the foreign person or agency or instrumentality of the foreign state, except that this subparagraph shall not apply—

(i) to any transaction subject to the reporting requirements of title V of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 413 et seq.; relating to congressional oversight of intelligence activities);

(ii) to the provision of medicines, medical equipment, and humanitarian assistance; or

(iii) to any credit, credit guarantee, or financial assistance provided by the Department of Agriculture to support the purchase of food or other agricultural commodities.

(F)(i) The President may exercise all powers granted to the President by the International Emergency Economic Powers Act

(50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) (except that the requirements of section 202 of such Act (50 U.S.C. 1701) shall not apply) to the extent necessary to block and prohibit all transactions in all property and interests in property of a foreign person or agency or instrumentality of the foreign state if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

(ii) The penalties provided for in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) shall apply to a person that knowingly violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of regulations promulgated under section 6(b) to carry out clause (i) to the same extent that such penalties apply to a person that knowingly commits an unlawful act described in section 206(a) of that Act.

(iii) The President may exercise all authorities provided to the President under sections 203 and 205 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702 and 1704) for purposes of carrying out clause (i).

(3) EXCEPTION.—The President shall not be required to apply sanctions with respect to a foreign person or an agency or instrumentality of a foreign state identified pursuant to subsection (a) if the President certifies in writing to the appropriate congressional committees that—

(A) the foreign person or agency or instrumentality of the foreign state—

(i) is no longer carrying out activities or transactions for which the sanctions were imposed pursuant to this subsection; or

(ii) has taken and is continuing to take significant verifiable steps toward terminating the activities or transactions for which the sanctions were imposed pursuant to this subsection; and

(B) the President has received reliable assurances from the foreign person or agency or instrumentality of the foreign state that it will not carry out any activities or transactions for which sanctions may be imposed pursuant to this subsection in the future.

(c) WAIVER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President may waive, on a case by case basis and for a period of not more than 180 days, a requirement under subsection (b) to impose or maintain sanctions with respect to a foreign person or agency or instrumentality of a foreign state if the President—

(A) determines that the waiver is in the national security interest of the United States; and

(B) not less than 30 days before the waiver takes effect, submits to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the waiver and the justification for the waiver.

(2) RENEWAL OF WAIVER.—The President may, on a case by case basis, renew a waiver under paragraph (1) for additional periods of not more than 180 days if the President—

(A) determines that the renewal of the waiver is in the national security interest of the United States; and

(B) not less than 15 days before the waiver expires, submits to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the renewal of the waiver and the justification for the renewal of the waiver.

(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—The authority to impose sanctions under subsection (b) with respect to a foreign person or an agency or instrumentality of a foreign state identified pursuant to subsection (a) is in addition to the authority to impose sanctions under any other provision of law with respect to foreign persons or agencies or instrumentalities of foreign states that directly or indirectly support international terrorism.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) FOREIGN STATE.—The term “foreign state” has the meaning given such term in section 1603(a) of title 28, United States Code.

(2) AGENCY OR INSTRUMENTALITY.—The term “agency or instrumentality” has the meaning given such term in section 1603(b) of title 28, United States Code.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and apply with respect to activities and transactions described in subsection (a) that are carried out on or after such date of enactment.

SEC. 4. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS THAT PROVIDE MATERIAL SUPPORT FOR THE TERRORIST ACTIVITIES OF HAMAS, THE PALESTINIAN ISLAMIC JIHAD, OR ANY AFFILIATE OR SUCCESSOR THEREOF.

(a) IDENTIFICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that identifies the following:

(A) Each government of a foreign country—

(i) with respect to which the Secretary of State determines has repeatedly provided support for acts of international terrorism pursuant to section 1754(c) of the Export Control Reform Act of 2018, section 40 of the Arms Export Control Act, section 620A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, or any other provision of law; and

(ii) with respect to which the President determines has provided direct or indirect material support for the terrorist activities of Hamas, the Palestinian Islamic Jihad, or any affiliate or successor thereof.

(B) Each government of a foreign country that—

(i) is not identified under subparagraph (A)(i); and

(ii) the President determines engaged in a significant transaction so as to contribute knowingly and materially to the efforts by the government of a foreign country described in subparagraph (A)(i) to provide direct or indirect material support for the terrorist activities of Hamas, the Palestinian Islamic Jihad, or any affiliate or successor thereof.

(2) FORM OF REPORT.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may contain a classified annex.

(b) IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall impose the following sanctions with respect to each government of a foreign country identified pursuant to subparagraph (A) or (B) of subsection (a)(1):

(A) The United States Government shall suspend, for a period of one year, United States assistance to the government of the foreign country.

(B) The Secretary of the Treasury shall instruct the United States Executive Director to each appropriate international financial institution to oppose, and vote against, for a period of one year, the extension by such institution of any loan or financial or technical assistance to the government of the foreign country.

(C) No item on the United States Munitions List (established pursuant to section 38 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2778)) or the Commerce Control List set forth in Supplement No. 1 to part 774 of title 15, Code of Federal Regulations, may be exported to the government of the foreign country for a period of one year.

(2) EXCEPTIONS.—The President shall not be required to apply sanctions with respect

to the government of a foreign country pursuant to paragraph (1)—

(A) with respect to materials intended to be used by United States military or civilian personnel at military facilities in the country; or

(B) if the application of such sanctions would prevent the United States from meeting the terms of any status of forces agreement to which the United States is a party.

(c) IMPOSITION OF ADDITIONAL SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS IDENTIFIED UNDER SUBSECTION (a)(1)(A).—The President shall impose the following additional sanctions with respect to each government of a foreign country identified pursuant to subsection (a)(1)(A):

(1) The President shall, pursuant to such regulations as the President may prescribe, prohibit any transactions in foreign exchange that are subject to the jurisdiction of the United States and in which the government of the foreign country has any interest.

(2) The President shall, pursuant to such regulations as the President may prescribe, prohibit any transfers of credit or payments between one or more financial institutions or by, through, or to any financial institution, to the extent that such transfers or payments are subject to the jurisdiction of the United States and involve any interest of the government of the foreign country.

(d) WAIVER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President may waive, on a case by case basis and for a period of not more than 180 days, a requirement under subsection (b) or (c) to impose or maintain sanctions with respect to a foreign government identified pursuant to subparagraph (A) or (B) of subsection (a)(1) if the President—

(A) determines that the waiver is in the national security interest of the United States; and

(B) not less than 30 days before the waiver takes effect, submits to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the waiver and the justification for the waiver.

(2) RENEWAL OF WAIVER.—The President may, on a case by case basis, renew a waiver under paragraph (1) for additional periods of not more than 180 days if the President—

(A) determines that the renewal of the waiver is in the national security interest of the United States; and

(B) not less than 15 days before the waiver expires, submits to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the renewal of the waiver and the justification for the renewal of the waiver.

(e) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—The authority to impose sanctions under subsection (b) or (c) with respect to each government of a foreign country identified pursuant to subparagraph (A) or (B) of subsection (a)(1) is in addition to the authority to impose sanctions under any other provision of law with respect to governments of foreign countries that provide material support to foreign terrorist organizations designated pursuant to section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189).

(f) TERMINATION.—The President may terminate any sanctions imposed with respect to the government of a foreign country pursuant to subsection (b) or (c) if the President determines and notifies the appropriate congressional committees that the government of the foreign country is no longer carrying out activities or transactions for which the sanctions were imposed and has provided assurances to the United States Government that it will not carry out the activities or transactions in the future.

(g) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and apply with respect to activities and transactions described in subparagraph

(A) or (B) of subsection (a)(1) that are carried out on or after such date of enactment.

SEC. 5. EXEMPTIONS FROM SANCTIONS UNDER SECTIONS 3 AND 4 RELATING TO PROVISION OF HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE.

(a) SANCTIONS UNDER SECTION 3.—The following activities shall be exempt from sanctions under section 3:

(1) The conduct or facilitation of a transaction for the sale of agricultural commodities, food, medicine, or medical devices to a foreign person described in section 3(a)(2).

(2) The provision of humanitarian assistance to a foreign person described in section 3(a)(2), including engaging in a financial transaction relating to humanitarian assistance or for humanitarian purposes or transporting goods or services that are necessary to carry out operations relating to humanitarian assistance or humanitarian purposes.

(b) SANCTIONS UNDER SECTION 4.—The following activities shall be exempt from sanctions under section 4:

(1) The conduct or facilitation of a transaction for the sale of agricultural commodities, food, medicine, or medical devices to Hamas, the Palestinian Islamic Jihad, or any affiliate or successor thereof described in section 4(a)(1).

(2) The provision of humanitarian assistance to Hamas, the Palestinian Islamic Jihad, or any affiliate or successor thereof described in section 4(a)(1), including engaging in a financial transaction relating to humanitarian assistance or for humanitarian purposes or transporting goods or services that are necessary to carry out operations relating to humanitarian assistance or humanitarian purposes.

SEC. 6. REPORT ON ACTIVITIES OF FOREIGN COUNTRIES TO DISRUPT GLOBAL FUNDRAISING, FINANCING, AND MONEY LAUNDERING ACTIVITIES OF HAMAS, THE PALESTINIAN ISLAMIC JIHAD, OR ANY AFFILIATE OR SUCCESSOR THEREOF.

(a) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that includes—

(A) a list of foreign countries that support Hamas, the Palestinian Islamic Jihad, or any affiliate or successor thereof, or in which Hamas maintains important portions of its financial networks;

(B) with respect to each foreign country on the list required by subparagraph (A)—

(i) an assessment of whether the government of the country is taking adequate measures to freeze the assets of Hamas, the Palestinian Islamic Jihad, or any affiliate or successor thereof within the territory of the country; and

(ii) in the case of a country the government of which is not taking adequate measures to freeze the assets of Hamas—

(I) an assessment of the reasons that government is not taking adequate measures to freeze those assets; and

(II) a description of measures being taken by the United States Government to encourage that government to freeze those assets;

(C) a list of foreign countries in which Hamas, the Palestinian Islamic Jihad, or any affiliate or successor thereof, conducts significant fundraising, financing, or money laundering activities;

(D) with respect to each foreign country on the list required by subparagraph (C)—

(i) an assessment of whether the government of the country is taking adequate measures to disrupt the fundraising, financing, or money laundering activities of Hamas, the Palestinian Islamic Jihad, or any affiliate or successor thereof within the territory of the country; and

(ii) in the case of a country the government of which is not taking adequate measures to disrupt those activities—

(I) an assessment of the reasons that government is not taking adequate measures to disrupt those activities; and

(II) a description of measures being taken by the United States Government to encourage that government to improve measures to disrupt those activities; and

(E) a list of foreign countries from which Hamas, the Palestinian Islamic Jihad, or any affiliate or successor thereof, acquires surveillance equipment, electronic monitoring equipment, or other means to inhibit communication or political expression in Gaza.

(2) FORM.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form to the greatest extent possible, and may contain a classified annex.

(b) BRIEFING.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter for a period not to exceed 3 years, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the heads of other applicable Federal departments and agencies (or their designees) shall provide to the appropriate congressional committees a briefing on the disposition of the assets and activities of Hamas, the Palestinian Islamic Jihad, or any successor or affiliate thereof related to fundraising, financing, and money laundering worldwide.

(c) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Financial Services, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

SEC. 7. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS.

(a) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to apply to the authorized intelligence activities of the United States.

(b) REGULATORY AUTHORITY.—The President shall, not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, promulgate regulations as are necessary for the implementation of this Act.

(c) EXCEPTION RELATING TO IMPORTATION OF GOODS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The authorities and requirements to impose sanctions authorized under this Act shall not include the authority or requirement to impose sanctions on the importation of goods.

(2) GOOD DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term “good” means any article, natural or man-made substance, material, supply or manufactured product, including inspection and test equipment, and excluding technical data.

(d) TERMINATION.—This Act shall terminate beginning—

(1) 30 days after the date on which the President certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that Hamas and the Palestinian Islamic Jihad, or any successor or affiliate thereof—

(A) are no longer designated as a foreign terrorist organization pursuant to section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189);

(B) are no longer subject to sanctions pursuant to—

(i) Executive Order 12947 (January 23, 1995; relating to prohibiting transactions with terrorists who threaten to disrupt the Middle East peace process); and

(ii) Executive Order 13224 (September 23, 2001; relating to blocking property and prohibiting transactions with persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism); and

(C) meet the criteria described in paragraphs (1) through (4) of section 9 of the Palestinian Anti-Terrorism Act of 2006 (22 U.S.C. 2378b note); or

(2) 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act,

whichever occurs earlier.

SEC. 8. DEFINITIONS.

Except as otherwise provided, in this Act:

(1) **ADMITTED.**—The term “admitted” has the meaning given such term in section 101(a)(13)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(13)(A)).

(2) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.**—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

(3) **FOREIGN PERSON.**—The term “foreign person” means—

(A) an individual who is not a United States person; or

(B) a corporation, partnership, or other nongovernmental entity which is not a United States person.

(4) **MATERIAL SUPPORT.**—The term “material support” has the meaning given the term “material support or resources” in section 2339A of title 18, United States Code.

(5) **PERSON.**—The term “person” means an individual or entity.

(6) **UNITED STATES PERSON.**—The term “United States person” means—

(A) a United States citizen or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence to the United States; or

(B) an entity organized under the laws of the United States or of any jurisdiction within the United States, including a foreign branch of such an entity.

SEC. 9. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled “Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation” for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ENGEL. I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include in the RECORD extraneous material on H.R. 1850.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me start by thanking Mr. MAST of Florida and Mr. GOTTHEIMER of New Jersey for their hard work on this legislation.

The United States designated both Hamas and Palestinian Islamic Jihad as foreign terrorist organizations more than 20 years ago. It is easy to see why: Hamas is responsible for the deaths of more than 400 Israelis and at least 25

American citizens. As recently as May of this year, the group fired hundreds of rockets from Gaza into southern Israel, including at Israeli civilian areas in Tel Aviv. And Palestinian Islamic Jihad is taking credit for a number of terrorist attacks in Israel, including an attack that killed a New Jersey American student in 1995.

Yet both groups, and particularly Hamas, still get cash from abroad. These funds are used to build tunnels into Israel and launch rockets at civilian populations. It is simply disgusting.

No one benefits from terrorism, Mr. Speaker: not Israelis, who just want to live in peace and security; not Palestinians, who want a state of their own but are exploited by these terrorists. A Palestinian state will never be built on the backs of terrorism.

Israel has the right to defend itself. The United States will continue to support that. In the meantime, we must do everything we can to prevent the loss of civilian life. That starts with cutting off the money to Hamas and Palestinian Islamic Jihad.

This bill would help do just that. It would impose new sanctions on those who support Hamas and Palestinian Islamic Jihad, the deep pockets that are enabling these groups to wage their campaigns of violence.

Of course, we don't want to punish innocent civilians, so this measure includes an important exception for humanitarian and medical assistance. This bill is designed to ensure that people in Gaza get what they need and that Hamas does not.

It is a good, straightforward piece of legislation. I am glad the House is considering it today, and I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES,
Washington, DC, July 22, 2019.

Hon. ELIOT ENGEL,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing concerning H.R. 1850, the “Palestinian International Terrorism Support Prevention Act of 2019.” In order to permit the H.R. 1850 to proceed expeditiously to the House Floor, I agree to forgo formal consideration of the bill.

The Committee on Financial Services takes this action to forego formal consideration of H.R. 1850 with our mutual understanding that, by foregoing formal consideration of H.R. 1850 at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that our Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as this or similar legislation moves forward. Our Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation and request your support for any such request.

Finally, I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding, and I would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during Floor consideration of H.R. 1850.

Sincerely,

MAXINE WATERS,
Chairwoman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, July 22, 2019.

Hon. MAXINE WATERS,
Chairwoman, Committee on Financial Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRWOMAN WATERS: I am writing to you concerning H.R. 1850, Palestinian International Terrorism Support Prevention Act of 2019. I appreciate your willingness to work cooperatively on this bill.

I acknowledge that provisions of the bill fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Financial Services under House Rule X, and that your Committee will forgo action on H.R. 1850 to expedite floor consideration. I further acknowledge that the inaction of your Committee with respect to the bill does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over the matters contained in the measure that fall within your jurisdiction. I will also support the appointment of Committee on Financial Services conferees during any House-Senate conference convened on this legislation.

Lastly, I will ensure that our exchange of letters is included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the resolution. I appreciate your cooperation and look forward to continuing to work with you as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

ELIOT L. ENGEL,
Chairman.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1850, the Palestinian International Terrorism Support Prevention Act of 2019.

In so doing, I first want to note Congressman BRIAN MAST's great personal sacrifice in the war against terror and how inspirational it is for each and every one of us to see him raise his voice time and again in this great battle of our age.

I also want to thank my good friend from New Jersey (Mr. GOTTHEIMER) for his lead cosponsorship of this legislation.

H.R. 1850 would require the President to report to Congress on those who knowingly provide financial and material support to terror groups such as Hamas and Palestinian Islamic Jihad, and then apply sanctions. These groups in particular have vowed to wipe out our ally Israel, and their support of terror is well known.

Beyond that, the legislation would require a listing of foreign countries where Hamas and the Palestinian Islamic Jihad engage in fundraising, financing, or money laundering, as well as list those countries which fail to take adequate measures to freeze the assets of these known terror groups.

Mr. Speaker, Hamas, a designated foreign terrorist organization, has killed over 400 Israelis and 25 Americans, rules the Gaza Strip with an iron fist, and uses its proximity to threaten Israel with impunity. As a result, the Israelis live in constant fear of Hamas rockets, tunnels, and other means of bringing violence to Israeli citizens.

Earlier this year, in a single weekend, Hamas fired over 600 rockets into Israel, killing four civilians, including an American.

As part of our close partnership with Israel, the United States has long sought to help Israel counter that threat. We have worked together on development of the Iron Dome aerial defense system. We continue to work together on counter-tunnelling technology.

And again, now, with this bill, we will help Israel to counter Hamas and the Palestinian Islamic Jihad by denying these groups the use of funds for their terror operations.

For over a decade, Mr. Speaker, the executive branch, across multiple administrations, has sanctioned many individuals as well as a select number of foreign entities that are associated with Hamas, all under the general authority of broad executive order.

This bill will codify and standardize those sanctions in statute and require the administration to comprehensively assess whether other supporters of Hamas should be sanctioned who have thus far remained unaffected by their support of this terrorist group.

The bill also requires the President to report on whether foreign governments are supporting Hamas or the Palestinian Islamic Jihad.

Mr. Speaker, we know well that Iran is the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism, and Hamas and the Palestinian Islamic Jihad are among Iran's many terrorist beneficiaries. In fact, it was reported just a few days ago a senior Hamas delegation was in Tehran.

This legislation will ensure that the Iranian regime is held to account for its maligned activity undermining peace and security in the Middle East. Bahrain's Foreign Minister said, last week, were it not for Iran's support for Hamas, there would be a better chance of achieving peace between Israel and the Palestinians.

The goal of this legislation is to cut off Iran's support for terrorism and, therefore, make peace more probable.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GOTTHEIMER).

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1850, the Palestinian International Terrorism Support Prevention Act, bipartisan legislation that I was proud to introduce with my good friend and Republican colleague, Congressman BRIAN MAST from Florida.

I also thank my good friend, Mr. SMITH from New Jersey, for his leadership.

I want to thank House Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman ELIOT ENGEL and Ranking Member MIKE MCCAUL, who were original cosponsors of our legislation, for their support and leadership.

Mr. Speaker, Hamas is a heinous terrorist group responsible for the murders of innocent American and Israeli citizens, which has been designated as a foreign terrorist organization by the State Department since 1997. It is well

known for firing rockets and digging terror tunnels into Israel and using Gazans, including women and children, as human shields. In fact, in May, terrorist groups like Hamas and PIJ in Gaza fired more than 600 rockets at Israel in just 36 hours.

It is critical that the United States and our allies continue to isolate Hamas and Palestinian Islamic Jihad by cutting them off at the source, including Iran.

As the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism, the Iranian regime provides more than \$70 million annually to the terrorist group Hamas in Gaza.

□ 1645

Just yesterday, Iran's supreme leader met with the political deputy chief of Hamas and renewed Iran's commitment to supporting this terrorist organization in its armed struggle against Israel.

Iran is also a principal funder of PIJ, helping the group amass a stockpile of more than 8,000 rockets aimed at Israel, an arsenal even larger than that of Hamas.

PIJ has also claimed credit for multiple terrorist attacks in Israel, including a gruesome suicide bus bombing in April 1995 that killed New Jersey student Alisa Flatow, a graduate of the Frisch School in my district in Paramus. And I will say forever that her memory should never be forgotten.

H.R. 1850 would require the President to submit to Congress an annual report for the next 3 years identifying foreign entities who assist Hamas, the Palestinian Islamic Jihad, or an affiliate or successor, and impose at least two or more crippling sanctions.

This bill would also crack down on foreign terrorist governments that support these groups, by suspending U.S. foreign aid, making it harder for them to receive loans or technical assistance, and tying up their credit.

This bipartisan bill will strengthen existing sanctions to weaken these terrorist groups that threaten our ally Israel, undermine peace, and further destabilize the Middle East.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in supporting this critical legislation and in the fight against terror.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to support the legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER).

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman for allotting me this time, and commend my colleagues, Mr. GOTTHEIMER and Mr. MAST, for bringing this bill.

I rise in support of H.R. 1850 and applaud the House for taking action to combat terrorist activity in the Middle East.

This bill sanctions individuals and foreign governments that knowingly and materially assist Hamas and the

Palestinian Islamic Jihad or an affiliate or successor entity.

These groups have been designated as foreign terrorist organizations by the Department of State since 1997. There is no disputing that they have and continue to sow instability and terror, including by indiscriminately launching countless rockets and mortars at Israel, attacks from subterranean tunnels, and even the use of human shields.

To achieve two states for two peoples living side by side in peace and security, we cannot let extremist voices control the narrative and we must always confront these terrorist activities.

But let me be clear: This bill does not target the vast majority of Palestinian people who long for peace. Rather, it solely goes after Hamas and PIJ and those who assist their terrorist activities.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume for purposes of closing.

Mr. Speaker, let me again thank our ranking member, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, and our colleagues who worked so hard on this good, bipartisan measure. I want to thank Mr. MAST, for whom I have enormous respect, and I thank Mr. SMITH, who is always there fighting the good fight and always consistent in saying what he believes.

Let me just say, the actions of Hamas, of the Palestinian Islamic Jihad, are a constant danger to innocent Israelis and innocent Palestinians. They are also a terrible roadblock that stand in the way of Israelis and Palestinians ever finding peace.

These terrorist groups don't want peace. They know that their violent tactics will never contribute to a peaceful resolution. They want to see Israel wiped off the map, plain and simple.

We need to crack down on them and we need to crack down on those who stand behind them in the shadows quietly fueling their violence that they carry out.

This bill would give us more tools to cut off the flow of resources, and that is why it is so important.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to support this bill and I urge all Members to do the same. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1850, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Lasky, one of its clerks, announced

that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1327. An act to extend authorization for the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001 through fiscal year 2092, and for other purposes.

CALLING ON GOVERNMENT OF CAMEROON AND ARMED GROUPS TO RESPECT THE HUMAN RIGHTS OF ALL CAMEROONIAN CITIZENS

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 358) calling on the Government of Cameroon and armed groups to respect the human rights of all Cameroonian citizens, to end all violence, and to pursue a broad-based dialogue without preconditions to resolve the conflict in the Northwest and Southwest regions.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 358

Whereas many Anglophone Cameroonians have long felt marginalized by official actions and policies of the Government of Cameroon, including the abolishment of a federal form of government, which was the constitutional basis under which English-speaking Southern Cameroonians entered into the union, and replacing it with a unitary state dominated by the Francophone majority;

Whereas, beginning in late 2016, protests organized by lawyers, teachers, and students were violently repressed by the Government of Cameroon, leading to numerous deaths and imprisonments, including of journalists, teachers, lawyers, and an Anglophone judge on the country's Supreme Court;

Whereas the conflict escalated in late September and early October 2017, when Cameroonian security forces brutally cracked down on peaceful Anglophone civilian demonstrators, resulting in dozens of deaths and leaving over 100 injured;

Whereas, in 2017, separatists launched a campaign to pressure school officials in the Northwest and Southwest Anglophone regions to go on strike as part of a boycott against the Government of Cameroon, and reportedly began burning school buildings, threatening education officials with violence if they did not comply with a boycott, and kidnapping for ransom children and teachers who defied the boycott;

Whereas numerous human rights monitors have documented armed separatists killing traditional leaders and targeting civilians, including women, children, and the elderly, who are perceived to be supporting or working with the Government of Cameroon, and reports indicate that armed separatists have killed scores of security force personnel;

Whereas the security forces of the Government of Cameroon have attacked medical facilities and health workers in the Northwest and Southwest regions;

Whereas numerous credible reports from human rights monitors, including the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, have documented the excessive use of force by government security forces against Cameroonian civilians living in the Anglophone regions, including the burning of villages, the use of live ammunition against protestors, arbitrary arrest and detention, torture, sexual abuse, and killing of civilians, including women, children, and the elderly;

Whereas the Department of State has expressed serious concern over the manner in which the government has used force to unlawfully restrict the rights to free expression and peaceful protest that are protected under the Cameroonian Constitution and international law;

Whereas the government has charged journalists, social activists, and members of political opposition parties with terrorism-related crimes and prosecuted them in military tribunals;

Whereas the Government of Cameroon arrested opposition leader Maurice Kamto and roughly 150 members of the Cameroon Renaissance Movement party following peaceful protests on January 26, 2019, charging them with crimes that could result in the death penalty and handling their cases at the Military Tribunal even though they are civilians;

Whereas the Government of Cameroon continued to place bans on Cameroon Renaissance Movement's attempts to hold peaceful protests, and civil society reported that security forces interfered with MRC registration processes in Yaoundé, Douala, and Bafoussam in February 2019;

Whereas the Government of Cameroon has repeatedly restricted freedoms of expression by shutting down the internet, harassing and detaining journalists, refusing licenses to independent media, and intensifying political attacks against the independent press;

Whereas the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs stated in April 2019 that more than 530,000 people were internally displaced in areas affected by the Anglophone conflict;

Whereas the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees reports that more than 32,000 Cameroonian refugees have registered in Nigeria;

Whereas the Department of State has expressly called on the Government of Cameroon to respect the rights, including the right to due process, of 47 Cameroonians forcibly returned in January 2018 from Nigerian custody to Cameroonian authorities, many of whom had reportedly submitted asylum claims in Nigeria; and

Whereas ten of the 47 Cameroonians forcibly returned from Nigeria now face charges before a military court punishable by the death penalty, while the other thirty-seven reportedly remain in detention without charge; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) strongly condemns the abuses committed in Cameroon's Anglophone regions by the Government of Cameroon security forces and armed groups, including extrajudicial killings and detentions, the use of force against nonviolent civilians and protestors, and violations of the freedoms of press, expression, and assembly;

(2) affirms that the United States continues to hold the Government of Cameroon responsible for upholding the rights of all citizens, regardless of political views or beliefs or the regions in which they reside, in accordance with Cameroon's international obligations and Cameroon's own Constitution;

(3) urges all parties, including political opposition groups, to exercise restraint and to ensure that protests remain peaceful;

(4) urges the Government of Cameroon to—

(A) initiate broad-based dialogue without preconditions and make a credible, full faith effort to work with religious and community leaders in the Anglophone region to address grievances and seek nonviolent solutions to resolve conflict and constitutional reforms that would protect minority concerns, such as reconstituting a Federal system;

(B) follow through on the initiatives developed to address grievances, including the

Commission of Bilingualism and Multiculturalism, the Ministry of Decentralization, and the National Commission for Disarmament, Demobilization, Reintegration, that currently offer no visible evidence of having played a constructive role in resolving the crisis;

(C) respect the fundamental rights of all Cameroonian citizens, including political activists and journalists;

(D) ensure that any security operations are conducted in accordance with international human rights standards, including efforts to ensure security forces only use force under appropriate circumstances;

(E) transparently investigate all allegations of human rights violations committed in the Anglophone regions and take the necessary measures to prevent arbitrary detention, torture, enforced disappearances, deaths in custody, and inhumane prison conditions;

(F) promptly charge or release all those detained in the context of the Anglophone crisis, including the Cameroonians forcibly returned from Nigeria, and ensure that any future detainees are treated with due process, in line with Cameroon's penal code;

(G) allow unfettered access to humanitarian and health care workers in accordance with humanitarian principles of humanity, neutrality, impartiality, and independence;

(H) release the leaders and members of the Cameroon Renaissance Movement party who were arrested following their peaceful protests, and ensure that this party, like others, can participate unfettered in upcoming municipal, parliamentary, and regional elections;

(I) release human rights defenders, civil society activists, political prisoners, journalists, trade unionists, teachers, and any other citizens who have been arbitrarily arrested and detained without trial or charge;

(J) ensure that detainees are treated fairly and humanely, with proper judicial proceedings, including a registry of those detained by the Cameroonian security forces, and with full access to legal resources; and

(K) ensure that Cameroon's antiterrorism legislation is used only to prosecute offenses that would be considered acts of terrorism under international legal standards, and cease to use this legislation to sanction activities that are protected by national and international guarantees of freedom of expression, peaceful assembly, and association with others; and

(5) urges the separatist groups to—

(A) engage with Cameroonian government officials, as well as civil society and religious leaders, in a broad-based dialogue without preconditions to peacefully express grievances and credibly engage in nonviolent efforts to resolve the conflict;

(B) immediately stop committing human rights abuses, including killings of civilians, use of child soldiers, torture, kidnapping, and extortion;

(C) end the school boycott immediately and cease attacks on schools, teachers, and education officials, and allow for the safe return of all students to class;

(D) end incitement to violence and hate speech on the part of the diaspora; and

(E) immediately release all civilians illegally detained or kidnapped in the Anglophone Northwest and Southwest regions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Res. 358.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this measure.

I want to start by thanking Ms. BASS and Mr. SMITH for bringing forward this resolution, which calls on the Government of Cameroon and armed groups to respect the human rights of all Cameroonian citizens, to end all violence, and to pursue a broad-based dialogue without preconditions to resolve the conflict in the anglophone regions of Cameroon.

Since October 2017, the region has been mired in conflict, with both the Government of Cameroon and armed separatists fighting one another and perpetrating human rights abuses.

While armed actors refuse to pursue a negotiated settlement to the conflict, innocent civilians continue to suffer. According to UNICEF, more than 80 percent of the schools in the anglophone regions of Cameroon remain closed, putting at risk the future prospects of children who are being denied access to education. In addition, 1.3 million people, including approximately 650,000 children, are in need of humanitarian assistance.

This resolution urges the Government of Cameroon to respect the fundamental rights of all Cameroonian citizens and follow through on initiatives developed to address grievances in the anglophone region. It also urges separatist groups to engage with Cameroonian government officials, civil society, and religious leaders to express grievances and engage in efforts to resolve the conflict and to stop committing human rights abuses and inciting violence.

For several months, the Swiss Government has been attempting to mediate a peaceful resolution to this crisis, and I am pleased this resolution demonstrates Congress' strong support for a negotiated settlement.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to support this resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 358, calling on the Government of Cameroon and armed groups to respect fundamental human rights and pursue dialogue to resolve the crisis in the anglophone region of that country.

Mr. Speaker, I especially want to thank Congresswoman KAREN BASS, the chairwoman of the Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations Subcommittee, of which I serve as the

ranking member, for this resolution. It is a bipartisan resolution, and, again, I thank her for her leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I would note that in the last Congress, I chaired a hearing on this Cameroon crisis as it was festering, seeking a way forward for peace. Sadly, that effort and all efforts made by the international community have been elusive thus far.

The conflict in Cameroon has its roots in long-simmering tensions between that country's francophone majority and the anglophone minority, concentrated in the northwest and southwest regions.

In 2016, protests by anglophone teachers and lawyers over marginalization and the lack of government services were met with a heavy-handed response. The government failed to genuinely address those legitimate grievances, which further inflamed tensions.

Brutal fighting between government security forces and local armed groups who called for separatism continues.

Today, there are over 500,000 displaced persons in the anglophone region.

Mr. Speaker, entire communities have been burned to the ground. Humanitarian convoys struggle to reach local populations or are even blocked and attacked by armed groups. Over half of the health facilities and hospitals have been damaged and forced to close. Children have been out of school for over 2 years.

According to the U.S. Department of State's Human Rights Report on Cameroon from 2018: "Government security forces were widely believed to be responsible for disappearances of suspected anglophone separatists, with reports of bodies dumped far from the site of the killings to make identification difficult."

This, in turn, is fueling resentment and separatist violence.

This resolution reiterates the U.S. position that all parties must immediately cease fighting and come to the negotiating table without preconditions. The Swiss-led mediation process is a hopeful step in that direction, which deserves support.

I would also note the critical role that has been played by the Catholic church, in particular Cardinal Tumi, in trying to reach common ground, and the need to support such efforts.

Hopefully, by weighing in, Congress can help promote the cause of peace and justice in the Republic of Cameroon.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers, and I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I again want to thank Ms. BASS and Mr. SMITH for their hard work. Again, as I mentioned before, Mr. SMITH is always working very, very hard to be on the side of justice.

For too long, the people in Cameroon's anglophone region have been

marginalized by the Cameroonian Government, and since 2017, conflict between the government and separatists have brought chaos and fear to those living in the region.

This resolution supports a negotiated settlement to the conflict that respects the basic human rights of its citizens, so Cameroon can become a country that is more peaceful and stable.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to join me in supporting this bipartisan piece of legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 358.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING BENEFITS INFORMATION IN SPANISH AND TAGALOG FOR VETERANS AND FAMILIES ACT

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2943) to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to make all fact sheets of the Department of Veterans Affairs in English and Spanish, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2943

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Providing Benefits Information in Spanish and Tagalog for Veterans and Families Act".

SEC. 2. FACT SHEETS.

(a) **LANGUAGES.**—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall make versions of all fact sheets of the Department of Veterans Affairs in English, Spanish, and Tagalog.

(b) **WEBSITE.**—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall establish and maintain a publicly available website of the Department of Veterans Affairs that contains links to all fact sheets of the Veterans Benefits Administration, Veterans Health Administration, and of the National Cemetery Administration. The website shall be accessible by a clearly labelled hyperlink on the homepage of the Department.

(c) **REPORT.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit a report to Congress regarding fact sheets described in subsection (a) and details of the Language Access Plan of the Department of Veteran Affairs. The report shall include the following:

(1) What the Secretary determines constitutes a fact sheet of the Department for purposes of this Act.

(2) How such fact sheets are utilized and distributed other than on and through the website of the Department.

(3) How such Language Access Plan is communicated to veterans, family members of veterans, and caregivers.

(4) The roles and responsibilities of patient advocates in the coordination of care for veterans with limited English proficiency, family members of such veterans, and caregivers.

(5) *Other demographic information that the Secretary determines appropriate regarding veterans with limited English proficiency.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material on H.R. 2943, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

□ 1700

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of Mr. CISNEROS' bill, H.R. 2943, as amended, which would direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide all VA fact sheets in English, Spanish, and Tagalog.

One of my chief priorities as chair of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs is to remove barriers that stand between veterans and their benefits. A language barrier should not prevent veterans from accessing the benefits they earned, and the burden should not be placed on veterans to request and wait for the VA to provide a translator.

Mandating that fact sheets be provided in Spanish and Tagalog will break down a significant barrier that stands in between Latinx and Filipino veterans and their VA benefits.

Mr. CISNEROS' bill, H.R. 2943, as amended, mandates that all fact sheets be available in English, Spanish, and Tagalog. Our veterans answered the call to serve from places around the world, including the Philippines and Puerto Rico, where English is not the predominant language. There are communities across the U.S., including in my district, where Spanish is commonly spoken and understood. This fix is easy; it does not come at an increased cost; and it is the right thing to do.

The Department of Veterans Affairs produces fact sheets that explain many VA programs and benefits. The VA fact sheets provide key facts, such as eligibility criteria, documents needed to help support claims, and links to appropriate application forms. These fact sheets explain the process for getting a VA-guaranteed home loan, applying for disability compensation, using GI Bill benefits, and obtaining burial benefits for veterans and their surviving family members.

Brochures and fact sheets explain VA healthcare benefits to veterans and caregivers. These fact sheets also advise veterans on the supporting documentation they need to help them apply for benefits so they are correctly

identified as eligible or their claims are successfully adjudicated.

During the codel I led to Puerto Rico this past weekend, I met with veterans who told me they are not receiving information on VA programs, and when they do receive information, it is in English, not Spanish. The one veteran who received a brochure on the MISSION Act in Spanish said it was incomplete compared to the English materials.

This disparity should not exist. Veterans, regardless of the language they speak or where they live, should be able to understand how to access their benefits easily.

I ask my colleagues to help our veterans who have done so much to serve our country and join me in supporting H.R. 2943, as amended.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I commend the chairman for bringing these bills forward in committee. I also commend the Speaker of the House for putting these bills on the agenda today, as well as the majority leader and the minority leader. These are very important bills.

I rise today to support H.R. 2943, as amended.

This bill, which is sponsored by Representative GIL CISNEROS of California, would require the Department of Veterans Affairs to make all fact sheets available in English, Spanish, and Tagalog.

During the markup of this bill, the committee adopted an amendment that Ranking Member ROE offered to further require the VA to post all fact sheets on a clearly identifiable, easily accessible location on the VA's website and require the VA to report to Congress on the Department's language-access plan to assist veterans with limited English proficiency.

This would ensure that the entirety of our veteran population, as well as their families and caregivers, are able to access and comprehend important information about VA benefits easily. It would also ensure that any barriers to care that might exist for veterans with limited English skills, Madam Speaker, are identified and broken down.

I am grateful to Representative CISNEROS for introducing this bill, and I am proud to support it today.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CISNEROS), my good friend and a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee who is also a veteran himself, the author of this legislation.

Mr. CISNEROS. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman TAKANO for his leader-

ship on this issue and for working with me to ensure this bill passed out of committee on a bipartisan basis. I also thank the gentleman from Florida for his support on this bill.

Madam Speaker, it is an honor to rise today to ask my colleagues for their support on my bill, H.R. 2943, the Providing Benefits Information in Spanish and Tagalog for Veterans and Families Act.

So many veterans have come from Puerto Rico, as well as the Philippines. The VA actually does have a hospital both in Puerto Rico and in the Philippines. This legislation would direct the VA Secretary to make all Department of Veterans Affairs fact sheets available in English, Spanish, and Tagalog.

According to the U.S. Census, as of July 1, 2017, the U.S. Hispanic population is approximately 59 million people, making up 18 percent of the Nation's total population, making people of Hispanic origin the Nation's largest ethnic or racial minority. The U.S. Census has also reported that Filipino Americans make up the third-largest AAPI subgroup, with an estimated 4 million people living in the United States.

With those changing demographics trending toward a more racially and ethnically diverse majority, the veteran population is diversifying at similar rates. The share of veterans who are Hispanic is expected to nearly double.

During my time in service, many of my proud brothers and sisters in arms were of Filipino descent.

With Spanish and Tagalog as the first language of an increasing number of veterans and their families, and our significant strategic national security footprint in Puerto Rico and the Philippines, it is important that fact sheets offered by the VA are made available to everyone.

This bill would serve as an initial step in ensuring veterans and their families with limited English proficiency have full access and information on VA services, without burden or barriers.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in support of my bill to ensure we do not overlook veterans and their families who may need these important fact sheets.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, this is a very important bill. We were just overseas and met with the troops, and we had quite a few servicemembers from Puerto Rico. I would like to say that most of them spoke perfect English, but they may not. They should have access to all the information in their first language.

Madam Speaker, I urge the passage of this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I am also prepared to close, and I yield myself the balance of my time to render my final comments.

Our veterans and their survivors deserve the best care possible. The VA benefits application process can be confusing. Congress has taken action to reduce confusion and ease the application process.

I remember when, only a few years ago, initial claims were taking more than a year. Today, initial disability claims are being completed in less than 160 days. This is, in part, due to streamlining the application process and providing more information to veterans.

As I learned during the codet to Puerto Rico, in emergencies like Hurricane Maria, veterans need to know how the VA can help them prepare for the next storm. They need to know that they can get additional supplies of medication. Veterans need to know where to go in an emergency when communications are disrupted. They also need to know how to apply for assistance and emergency benefits after a disaster like Hurricane Maria because these disasters will happen again.

The VA fact sheet on natural disasters, which tells veterans and their families which website to go to and where to call when their benefits are interrupted due to natural disasters, is only available in English. Yet, both the Philippines and Puerto Rico experience natural disasters like hurricanes, typhoons, and earthquakes.

Mandating that VA fact sheets are made available in more than one language is yet another example of ways we can eliminate barriers for our veterans, streamline the application process, and help them get to the right resources when there is an emergency. Providing fact sheets in Tagalog and Spanish could even save lives.

Madam Speaker, I wholeheartedly support H.R. 2943, as amended, and, again, I ask my colleagues to join me in support of this bill.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. CASTOR of Florida). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2943, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to make all fact sheets of the Department of Veterans Affairs in English, Spanish, and Tagalog."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HELPING EXPAND AND LAUNCH TRANSITIONAL HEALTH FOR WOMEN VETERANS ACT

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2942) to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out the

Women's Health Transition Training pilot program through at least fiscal year 2020, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2942

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Helping Expand and Launch Transitional Health for Women Veterans Act" or "HEALTH Act".

SEC. 2. ENCOURAGEMENT OF PARTICIPATION IN WOMEN'S HEALTH TRANSITION TRAINING PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) *DURATION.*—*The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall carry out the Women's Health Transition Training pilot program (in this section referred to as the "pilot program") until at least September 30, 2020.*

(b) *REPORT.*—*Not later than September 30, 2020, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall jointly submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the pilot program that includes the following:*

(1) *For the period since the commencement of the pilot program—*

(A) *the number of women members by military department (with respect to Department of the Navy, separately for the Navy and Marine Corps) who participated in the pilot program;*

(B) *the number of courses held under the pilot program; and*

(C) *the locations at which such courses were held, and the number of seats available and the number of participants at each such location.*

(2) *With respect to the number of members who participated in the pilot program as specified under paragraph (1)—*

(A) *the number who enrolled in the health care system established under section 1705(a) of title 38, United States Code; and*

(B) *the number who attended at least one health care appointment at a medical facility of the Department of Veterans Affairs.*

(3) *Data relating to—*

(A) *satisfaction with courses held under the pilot program;*

(B) *improved awareness of health care services administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; and*

(C) *any other available statistics regarding the pilot program.*

(4) *A discussion of regulatory, legal, or resource barriers to—*

(A) *making the pilot program permanent to enable access by a greater number of women members at locations throughout the United States;*

(B) *offering the pilot program online for women members who are unable to attend courses held under the pilot program in person; and*

(C) *the feasibility of automatically enrolling pilot program participants in the health care system established under section 1705(a) of title 38, United States Code.*

(c) *APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.*—*In this section, the term "appropriate congressional committees" means the Committees on Veterans' Affairs and the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material on H.R. 2942, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, women veterans are the fastest growing demographic within the veteran population yet underutilize VA healthcare resources. This is primarily due to misperceptions about eligibility and available resources.

Many women leaving the military may not realize that they are eligible to use VA services, nor that VA offers extensive gender-specific care, such as mammography; prenatal, maternity, and infertility care; and mental healthcare that addresses complex trauma, including military sexual trauma, otherwise known as MST, and combat-related post-traumatic stress disorder, or PTSD.

The VA and U.S. Air Force Women's Health Transition Training pilot program works to address issues commonly experienced by women veterans when accessing VA care. This successful improvement to the Transition Assistance Program, or the TAP, is jointly run by the USAF and VA. Transitioning women servicemembers can attend an additional day of TAP to learn about women's healthcare, counseling, and social services available at the VA to ensure that they receive a warm handoff between the Department of Defense and the Veterans Administration.

Mr. CISNEROS' bill would expand the Women's Health Transition Training pilot program to more locations and authorizes the program through the end of fiscal year 2020.

This great legislation has my full support.

Madam Speaker, although women are the fastest growing cohort of veterans, women veterans are less likely to seek care and services at VA. This bill aims to address that and make the VA more accessible and responsive to women veterans.

Madam Speaker, this pilot program educates transitioning servicewomen about VA's healthcare services. The data collected from this pilot program can be applied to the Transition Assistance Program to better meet the needs of all transitioning servicemembers.

Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. CISNEROS for his hard work on this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2942, as amended, the Helping Expand and Launch Transitional Health, or HEALTH, for Women Veterans Act.

I thank and congratulate Representative CISNEROS on this very good bill,

and I thank the chairman and the ranking member for bringing this bill forward.

□ 1715

Women are joining the armed services in record numbers, Madam Speaker, and are an important part of the military and veteran communities. In recognition of the brave services these women are providing our country, it is incumbent on us to ensure that they are aware of the many benefits afforded to them.

Unfortunately, far too many women veterans are unaware of the healthcare services available for women through the Department of Veterans Affairs Veterans Health Administration. That is why VA and the Air Force partnered together to create a Women's Health Transition Training pilot program.

The pilot program provides servicewomen who are on the verge of leaving the military with information about the care they may be eligible to receive from VA, how to enroll in VA, and how to successfully transition to civilian life. In short, it empowers women to make informed decisions about their healthcare by educating them about the benefits available.

As of June 5, there have been 50 pilot sessions, Madam Speaker, and the women who have attended those sessions have reported a 98 percent satisfaction rate.

The Helping Expand and Launch Transitional Health for Women Veterans Act would extend the Women's Health Transition Training pilot program through fiscal year 2020 to ensure that women leaving the military continue to benefit from it.

This bill is sponsored, again, by Representative Gil Cisneros from California, and I thank the gentleman for his work. It is a very, very important bill.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CISNEROS), a veteran himself, the author of this legislation, and a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

Mr. CISNEROS. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding, and I again want to thank the gentleman from Florida for his support on this bill as well.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank Chairman TAKANO and Ranking Member ROE of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee for working with me to ensure my bill passed out of committee on a bipartisan basis.

Today, I rise to ask my colleagues for their support on my bill, H.R. 2942, the Helping Expand and Launch Transitional Health for Women Veterans Act, introduced with my colleague and fellow veteran, Congresswoman CHRISSEY HOULAHAN.

As a Navy veteran, one of my top priorities is ensuring that active service-

members transitioning into the civilian world are connected to the VA system and provided the best education and tools needed to succeed.

Despite being the fastest growing cohort in our military community, many servicewomen face unique challenges with their VA benefits. Studies have shown that women veterans, on average, connect with the VA nearly 3 years after military service, which can result in higher rates of physical and mental health issues. In a male-dominated VA system, it is not surprising why women veterans often report that they are uncomfortable seeking women-specific care.

My bill would require the Department of Veterans Affairs to extend an ongoing initiative with the Air Force and the Transition Assistance Program, which educates transitioning servicewomen about women's healthcare at the VA.

Specifically, the bill would mandate an extension of the program across all military service branches and require a report on the feasibility of making it permanent. Participants of this pilot program report an increased likelihood to use VA healthcare and have shown higher rates of confidence with the VA.

It is time our women servicemembers and veterans receive the care they need, and this bill will do just that. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of my bill to ensure that, when servicewomen transition to civilian life, they are provided with the information that will help them navigate their VA benefits in a commonsense way.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Madam Speaker, I have no other speakers, and I am prepared to close.

I want to say that this is an outstanding bill. I am glad we worked on this bill because we have a lot of women veterans who need this, and I want to make it permanent. So, again, let's pass this bill as soon as possible and get it to the Senate.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I am also prepared to close.

I will say in my final remarks that I urge all of my colleagues to support our women veterans by joining me in passing this very important legislation, H.R. 2942, as amended, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2942, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RYAN KULES SPECIALLY ADAPTIVE HOUSING IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2019

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3504) to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for improvements to the specially adapted housing program and educational assistance programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3504

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Ryan Kules Specially Adaptive Housing Improvement Act of 2019".

SEC. 2. PRIORITY IN AWARD OF SPECIALLY ADAPTED HOUSING GRANTS TO SERIOUSLY ILL VETERANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2101 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(d) PRIORITY FOR SERIOUSLY ILL VETERANS.—(1) In providing assistance under this section, the Secretary shall give priority to seriously ill veterans.

"(2) In this section, the term 'seriously ill veteran' shall have the meaning given such term by the Secretary."

(b) DEFINITION OF SERIOUSLY ILL VETERAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—By not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall—

(A) determine the meaning of the term "seriously ill veteran" for purposes of subsection (d) of section 2101 of title 38, United States Code, as added by subsection (a); and

(B) submit to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives the meaning of such term as so determined.

(2) APPLICABILITY.—The definition of "seriously ill veteran" as determined under paragraph (1) shall apply for purposes of such subsection (d) beginning on the date that is 30 days after the date on which the Secretary submits to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives the definition of such term as so determined.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on October 1, 2020, and apply with respect to assistance provided on or after that date.

SEC. 3. INCREASE IN AMOUNTS OF ASSISTANCE PROVIDED.

(a) INCREASE OF NUMBER OF GRANTS PER VETERAN.—Section 2102(d)(3) of such title is amended by striking "three" and inserting "six".

(b) INCREASE IN NUMBER OF APPLICATIONS AUTHORIZED TO BE APPROVED.—Section 2101(a)(4) of such title is amended by striking "30 applications" and inserting "120 applications".

(c) INCREASE IN MAXIMUM AMOUNT OF ASSISTANCE FOR ADAPTATION TO VETERAN'S RESIDENCE.—Section 2102(b)(2) of such title is amended by striking "\$12,000" and inserting "\$19,733".

(d) INCREASE IN AGGREGATE AMOUNT OF ASSISTANCE FOR ACQUISITION OF HOUSING WITH SPECIAL FEATURES.—Section 2102(d)(1) of such title is amended by striking "\$63,780" and inserting "\$98,492".

(e) INCREASE IN AGGREGATE AMOUNT OF ASSISTANCE FOR ADAPTATIONS TO VETERANS' RESIDENCES.—Section 2102(d)(2) of such title

is amended by striking “\$12,756” and inserting “\$19,733”.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE AND APPLICATION.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 2020. The amendments made by subsections (c) and (d) shall apply with respect to individuals who have not received the maximum amount of assistance under section 2101 of title 38, United States Code, before such date.

SEC. 4. PROVISION OF ADDITIONAL AMOUNTS OF SPECIALLY ADAPTED HOUSING ASSISTANCE FOR CERTAIN VETERANS.

Section 2102 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(f)(1) Notwithstanding the aggregate amounts specified in subsection (d), a covered veteran may apply for and receive an additional amount of assistance under subsection (a) or (b) of section 2101 of this title in an amount that does not exceed half of the amount specified in subsection (d).

“(2) In this subsection, a covered veteran is a veteran who—

“(A) is described in section 2101(a)(2) of this title;

“(B) first receives assistance under this chapter on or after October 1, 2020;

“(C) as of the date of the veteran’s application for assistance under paragraph (1), most recently received assistance under this chapter more than ten years before such date; and

“(D) lives in a home that the Secretary determines does not have adaptations that are reasonably necessary because of the veteran’s disability.”.

SEC. 5. IMPROVEMENT TO WORK-STUDY ALLOWANCE PROGRAM.

(a) PAYMENT OF ALLOWANCE.—Subsection (a) of section 3485 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “Individuals” and inserting “In accordance with paragraph (4), individuals”;

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (4), (5), and (6) as paragraphs (5), (6), and (7), respectively; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

“(4)(A) The Secretary shall carry out this section by providing to educational institutions an annual amount for the institution to use in paying work-study allowance under paragraph (1) to individuals enrolled at the institution.

“(B) With respect to an educational institution that participated in the work-study program under this section during the academic year beginning August 1, 2018, the Secretary shall determine the annual amount to provide to the educational institution under subparagraph (A) as follows:

“(i) For the academic year beginning August 1, 2020, the amount shall be the total amount the Secretary paid under this section to individuals enrolled at such educational institution during the academic year beginning August 1, 2018.

“(ii) Except as provided by subparagraph (D)(ii), for each academic year beginning on or after August 1, 2021, the amount shall be the total amount the educational institution paid under this section for work-study allowance to individuals enrolled at such educational institution during the previous academic year in which individuals participated in the work-study program.

“(C) With respect to an educational institution that did not participate in the work-study program under this section during the academic year beginning August 1, 2018, the Secretary shall determine the annual amount to provide to the educational institution under subparagraph (A) as follows:

“(i) For the first academic year in which the educational institution participates in

the work-study program beginning on or after August 1, 2020, the amount shall be an amount the Secretary determines appropriate based on amounts provided to similar educational institutions pursuant to subparagraph (B).

“(ii) Except as provided by subparagraph (D)(ii), for each academic year occurring after the academic year specified in clause (i), the amount shall be the total amount the educational institution paid under this section for work-study allowance to individuals enrolled at such educational institution during the previous academic year in which individuals enrolled at such educational institution participated in the work-study program.

“(D)(i) Except as provided in clause (ii), if the Secretary provides an annual amount to an educational institution under subparagraph (B) or (C) that is more than the total amount the educational institution pays to individuals under paragraph (1), the educational institution shall return to the Secretary the unpaid amount and the Secretary shall transfer such amount into the general fund of the Treasury.

“(ii) If the annual amount provided to an educational institution under subparagraph (B) or (C) is more, but less than 25 percent more, than the total amount the educational institution pays to individuals under paragraph (1), and the educational institution plans to participate in the work-study program under this section during the subsequent academic year, the educational institution may retain the amount of the overpayment if the educational institution notifies the Secretary of the amount of the overpayment and the intention of the educational institution to retain such amount. Any amount retained by an educational institution under this clause may only be used by the educational institution to provide work-study allowance to individuals enrolled at the educational institution.

“(iii) At any time an educational institution may request the Secretary to increase the annual amount that the Secretary provides the educational institution under subparagraph (B) or (C).

“(E) Pursuant to section 3690(c), section 3693, and other provisions of chapter 36 of this title, the Secretary shall ensure that educational institutions carry out the work-study allowance program in compliance with this section.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subsection (e)(1) of such section is amended by striking “subsection (a)(4)” and inserting “subsection (a)(5)”.

(c) APPLICATION.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to a quarter, semester, or term, as applicable, commencing on or after August 1, 2020.

SEC. 6. EXPANSION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR FRY SCHOLARSHIP TO CHILDREN AND SPOUSES OF CERTAIN DECEASED MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (b) of section 3311 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (10) as paragraph (12); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (9) the following new paragraphs (10) and (11):

“(10) An individual who is the child or spouse of a person who, on or after September 11, 2001, dies in line of duty while serving on duty other than active duty as a member of the Armed Forces.

“(11) An individual who is the child or spouse of a member of the Selected Reserve who dies on or after September 11, 2001—

“(A) from a service-connected disability; and

“(B) not later than four years after the date of the last discharge or release of that

member from active duty or active duty for training.”.

(b) APPLICABILITY DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) apply with respect to a quarter, semester, or term, as applicable, commencing on or after August 1, 2020.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Subsection (f) of such section is amended by striking “paragraph (9)” each place it appears and inserting “paragraphs (9), (10), and (11)”.

(2) Section 3322 of such title is amended—
(A) in subsection (e), by striking both “sections 3311(b)(9) and 3319” and inserting “section 3319 and paragraph (9), (10), or (11) of section 3311 of this title”; and

(B) in subsection (f), by striking “section 3311(b)(9)” and inserting “paragraph (9), (10), or (11) of section 3311 of this title”; and

(C) in subsection (h)(2), by striking “either section 3311(b)(9) or chapter 35” and inserting “either chapter 35 or paragraph (9), (10), or (11) of section 3311”.

SEC. 7. TREATMENT OF CERTAIN PREPARATORY COURSES AS PROGRAMS OF EDUCATION FOR PURPOSES OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 33 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 3315A the following new section:

“§ 3315B. Preparatory courses for licensure, certification, or national tests

“(a) IN GENERAL.—An individual entitled to educational assistance under this chapter shall also be entitled to payment for a preparatory course for a licensing or certification test that is required or used to enter into, maintain, or advance in employment in a predetermined and identified vocation or profession.

“(b) AMOUNT.—The amount of educational assistance payable under this chapter for a course described in subsection (a) is the lesser of—

“(1) the fee charged for the course; or

“(2) the amount of entitlement available to the individual under this chapter at the time of payment for the course under this section.

“(c) CHARGE AGAINST ENTITLEMENT.—The number of months of entitlement charged an individual under this chapter for a course described in subsection (a) shall be pro-rated based on the actual amount of the fee charged for the course relative to the rate for 1 month payable—

“(1) for the academic year beginning on August 1, 2020, \$1,460; or

“(2) for an academic year beginning on any subsequent August 1, the amount for the previous academic year beginning on August 1 under this subsection, as increased by the percentage increase equal to the most recent percentage increase determined under section 3015(h).”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 3315A the following new item:

“3315B. Preparatory courses for licensure, certification, or national tests.”.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 3532(g) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting “or a preparatory course described in section 3315B(a) of this title” after “or national test providing an opportunity for course credit at institutions of higher learning described in section 3501(a)(5) of this title”; and

(2) in paragraphs (2) and (3), by inserting “or preparatory course” after “test” everywhere it appears.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to months beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 8. ADJUSTMENT OF LOAN FEES.

Section 3729(b)(2) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking the loan fee table and inserting the following:

“Type of loan	Active duty veteran	Reservist	Other obligor
(A)(i) Initial loan described in section 3710(a) to purchase or construct a dwelling with 0-down, or any other initial loan described in section 3710(a) other than with 5-down or 10-down (closed on or after October 1, 2004, and before January 1, 2020)	2.15	2.40	NA
(A)(ii) Initial loan described in section 3710(a) to purchase or construct a dwelling with 0-down, or any other initial loan described in section 3710(a) other than with 5-down or 10-down (closed on or after January 1, 2020, and before October 1, 2027)	2.30	2.30	NA
(A)(iii) Initial loan described in section 3710(a) to purchase or construct a dwelling with 0-down, or any other initial loan described in section 3710(a) other than with 5-down or 10-down (closed on or after October 1, 2027, and before October 1, 2029)	2.15	2.15	NA
(A)(iv) Initial loan described in section 3710(a) to purchase or construct a dwelling with 0-down, or any other initial loan described in section 3710(a) other than with 5-down or 10-down (closed on or after October 1, 2029)	1.40	1.40	NA
(B)(i) Subsequent loan described in section 3710(a) to purchase or construct a dwelling with 0-down, or any other subsequent loan described in section 3710(a) (closed on or after October 1, 2004, and before January 1, 2020)	3.30	3.30	NA
(B)(ii) Subsequent loan described in section 3710(a) to purchase or construct a dwelling with 0-down, or any other subsequent loan described in section 3710(a) (closed on or after January 1, 2020, and before October 1, 2027)	3.60	3.60	NA
(B)(iii) Subsequent loan described in section 3710(a) to purchase or construct a dwelling with 0-down, or any other subsequent loan described in section 3710(a) (closed on or after October 1, 2027, and before October 1, 2029)	3.30	3.30	NA
(B)(iv) Subsequent loan described in section 3710(a) to purchase or construct a dwelling with 0-down, or any other subsequent loan described in section 3710(a) (closed on or after October 1, 2029)	1.25	1.25	NA
(C)(i) Loan described in section 3710(a) to purchase or construct a dwelling with 5-down (closed before January 1, 2020)	1.50	1.75	NA
(C)(ii) Loan described in section 3710(a) to purchase or construct a dwelling with 5-down (closed on or after January 1, 2020, and before October 1, 2027)	1.65	1.65	NA
(C)(iii) Loan described in section 3710(a) to purchase or construct a dwelling with 5-down (closed on or after October 1, 2027, and before October 1, 2029)	1.50	1.50	NA
(C)(iv) Loan described in section 3710(a) to purchase or construct a dwelling with 5-down (closed on or after October 1, 2029)	0.75	0.75	NA
(D)(i) Loan described in section 3710(a) to purchase or construct a dwelling with 10-down (closed before January 1, 2020)	1.25	1.50	NA
(D)(ii) Loan described in section 3710(a) to purchase or construct a dwelling with 10-down (closed on or after January 1, 2020, and before October 1, 2027)	1.40	1.40	NA
(D)(iii) Loan described in section 3710(a) to purchase or construct a dwelling with 10-down (closed on or after October 1, 2027, and before October 1, 2029)	1.25	1.25	NA
(D)(iv) Loan described in section 3710(a) to purchase or construct a dwelling with 10-down (closed on or after October 1, 2029)	0.50	0.50	NA
(E) Interest rate reduction refinancing loan	0.50	0.50	NA
(F) Direct loan under section 3711	1.00	1.00	NA
(G) Manufactured home loan under section 3712 (other than an interest rate reduction refinancing loan)	1.00	1.00	NA
(H) Loan to Native American veteran under section 3762 (other than an interest rate reduction refinancing loan)	1.25	1.25	NA
(I) Loan assumption under section 3714	0.50	0.50	0.50
(J) Loan under section 3733(a)	2.25	2.25	2.25 ¹ .

SEC. 9. AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS TO ASSIST BLIND VETERANS WHO HAVE NOT LOST USE OF A LEG IN ACQUIRING SPECIALLY ADAPTED HOUSING.

Section 2101 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

- (1) in subsection (a)(2)(B)(ii)—
- (A) in the matter preceding subclause (I), by striking “due to—” and inserting “due to blindness in both eyes, having central visual acuity of 20/200 or less in the better eye with the use of a standard correcting lens. For the purposes of this clause, an eye with a limitation in the fields of vision such that the widest diameter of the visual field subtends an angle no greater than 20 degrees shall be considered as having a central visual acuity of 20/200 or less.”; and
- (B) by striking subclauses (I) and (II); and
- (2) in subsection (b)(2)—
- (A) by striking subparagraph (A); and
- (B) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (C) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively.

SEC. 10. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled “Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation” for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that

such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material on H.R. 3504, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, the Veterans’ Affairs Committee is proud to bring to the floor H.R. 3504, as amended, the Ryan Kules Specially Adaptive Housing Improvement Act of 2019, which is named after Army veteran Ryan Kules.

Madam Speaker, we are honored to have Ryan with us today.

Ryan’s vehicle was struck by an explosive device in 2005, which took the lives of Sergeant Jerry Mills and Sergeant Donald Hasse, and took Ryan’s right arm and left leg.

He was able to use the VA’s Specially Adapted Housing program to modify his house to suit his needs and the needs of his wife and children. However, the program simply didn’t provide enough assistance, leaving Ryan and his family owing more than \$90,000 out of pocket for improvements.

The VA’s Specially Adapted Housing program offers grants to servicemembers and veterans with certain severe service-connected disabilities. The grants assist with building, remodeling, or purchasing an adapted home. However, portions of the program don’t reflect the needs of today’s veterans, which is why I am proud of our work on the House Veterans’ Affairs Committee to make the SAH program work for today’s veterans.

H.R. 3504, as amended, does this by prioritizing grants for seriously ill veterans, doubling the cap on the total number of grants issued to a veteran, increasing the total applications authorized, and increasing the maximum

benefit for up to 50 percent of the cost of a specially adapted home.

In addition, this legislation doesn't stop there. H.R. 3504, as amended, includes legislation from Representative LURIA regarding expanding the SAH program to cover blind veterans.

I was shocked to learn that the existing SAH program only covers blind veterans who also have lost a limb. H.R. 3504, as amended, includes Representative LURIA's Housing Access for Blind Veterans Act.

I heard from a blind veteran in Ponce, Puerto Rico, last weekend about some of the challenges that he faces. As Puerto Rico continues to rebuild after Hurricane Maria, allowing disabled veterans, including veterans with visual impairments, to apply for Specially Adapted Housing grants can help repair and improve their homes and lives.

I thank the gentlewoman for her work and Ranking Member ROE's support.

Also, H.R. 3504, as amended, includes Representative SABLAN's GI Bill Access to Career Credentials Act. This legislation expands the GI Bill to cover preparatory courses for professional tests, allowing veterans to more easily obtain career credentials.

Finally, H.R. 3504, as amended, includes a modernization of the VA's work-study program, streamlining the payment process to make work-study programs easier for veterans to participate in.

I thank Ranking Member BILIRAKIS and Chairman LEVIN for bringing this legislation to the committee, fully paid for.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3504, as amended, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to rise today in support of my bill, H.R. 3504, as amended, the Ryan Kules Specially Adaptive Housing Improvement Act of 2019.

Our highest calling as a committee is to empower those who have been injured in defense of our country to live independent and productive lives.

The Specially Adapted Housing program, or SAH grant program, is one way we do that, and this bill makes several needed improvements to that program.

SAH grants are awarded to certain severely injured servicemembers and veterans to help them adapt their homes to increase their comfort and independence. It is a quality of life issue, Madam Speaker.

SAH grants can be used to make all kinds of home adaptations, including installing grab bars, wheelchair ramps and lifts, lowering countertops, and widening hallways and doorways.

My bill would make needed improvements to this program and provide prioritization when processing SAH

grants for veterans with serious illnesses like ALS.

It would also double the number of times a veteran can use an SAH grant and increase the base amount of funding available to veterans by 15 percent.

Finally, this bill would authorize VA to provide additional funding for veterans 10 years after they use their SAH grants to make additional home improvements as they age. So, of course, they might want to get into a bigger house because their families grow, and they should have that opportunity to do so.

This bill also includes H.R. 3640, the Housing Access for Blind Veterans Act, which was introduced last week by Representative ROE and Representative ELAINE LURIA from Virginia, the chair of the Subcommittee on Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs, to provide additional SAH funding to veterans who are legally blind. It is so important that we do this.

I am proud to have named this bill after my friend Ryan Kules, an Army veteran, and I had the privilege of meeting him today and his wonderful family. It is a beautiful family.

On November 29, 2005, while he was serving in Iraq, Ryan's vehicle was struck by an improvised explosive device, an IED, and Ryan sustained multiple injuries, including the loss of his leg and arm. He is a true hero, Madam Speaker.

Those injuries made him eligible for the SAH grant program following his separation from service. Many of the ideas in this bill came from Ryan's own experiences with the SAH program.

I am grateful to Ryan for his service, for his continued advocacy, and for allowing us to use his name for this important legislation.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank the Wounded Warriors Project and the Paralyzed Veterans of America for their help with crafting this bill, as well as my friend and chairman, Representative MIKE LEVIN from California, who is the cosponsor of this bill and who does an outstanding job in committee, where we work in a bipartisan fashion.

□ 1730

Madam Speaker, this bill also includes the text of H.R. 3535, the GI Bill Work Study Improvement Act. This bill was introduced by my friend, Representative RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Representative SUSIE LEE of Nevada, and Ranking Member ROE of Tennessee to improve VA's workstudy program.

The idea for this bill came from the student veterans and school officials who attended a GI Bill forum that Representative DAVIS had, and Representative ROE was in attendance, of course. He is the ranking member of the full committee.

I commend Representative DAVIS for taking the concerns of his student veterans' constituents to heart and acting to address them by improving the way that those payments are made to eligible GI beneficiaries. The best ideas

come from the people, Madam Speaker, as you know.

This would entail changes to the current process where the student veterans are paid workstudy benefits by VA to a new process where student veterans are paid directly by their school. This makes sense. This will be done by block granting workstudy money to schools allowing them to administer the payments to student veterans. This will improve timeliness and accuracy of payments to student veterans.

Finally, H.R. 3504, as amended, also includes the text of my bill, H.R. 2221, the Fry Scholarship Improvement Act, which would expand eligibility for the Fry Scholarship to certain survivors of members of the National Guard and Reserve. Representative ANDY BARR worked on this bill as well, and he was a great advocate. Of course, he is an advocate for the National Guard and Reserve, Madam Speaker. The current Fry Scholarship provides post 9/11 GI Bill benefits to surviving spouses and dependent children of servicemembers who have died while on Active Duty.

I would like to thank the Tragedy Assistance Program for Survivors, or TAPS, for bringing this idea to our attention and again Chairman LEVIN for being an original cosponsor of this bill.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important piece of legislation today.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS).

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), the chair, Mr. TAKANO, and also Dr. ROE, the ranking member and former chair of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, for all the work they do for our veterans.

It was at a meeting with Dr. ROE in Springfield, Illinois, last summer that he heard from my constituents who represented the 13 colleges that I am blessed to represent in central Illinois. They got together, and they talked about the GI Bill Work Study Improvement Act language that is included in this bill right now.

Section 5 of this bill contains our improvement language, and I really want to thank SUSIE LEE, my colleague. I want to thank Dr. ROE again and my colleague, MIKE BOST, from Illinois because this legislation creates a block grant program to disburse the funding that would normally be used by the VA to administer their workstudy program.

We heard from the college administrators. It wasn't going well as is; they were leaving veterans behind. They didn't know if the students were going to be able to enroll, and the colleges didn't know when they were going to get the money. This is a fix that came directly from listening to the people who are serving our veterans at our educational institutions.

This is what bipartisanship looks like. It is an idea that comes from people who are affected, and those who are

affected are our heroes who protect our great Nation. This change is necessary, this change is bipartisan, and this change is long overdue. I want to thank everybody again for working on this bill.

Madam Speaker, I urge a “yes” vote on this bill.

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I want to just add that I hear an equal number of names mentioned from both sides of the aisle who have contributed to the content of this bill. This is what bipartisanship looks like. I am very proud that we have brought this bill out of committee on a unanimous basis and that I have heard each side mention multiple names of Members who have contributed language to this bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

This is a great bill named after a great American hero. We need to pass this bill. I want to thank the leadership of the chairman and the ranking member for bringing it to the floor.

Again, we have got to get this done for our heroes. We have got to get it to the Senate and pass it as soon as possible because it is so badly needed. I appreciate it very much. I thank the staff for their support.

Madam Speaker, I encourage Members to vote positive on this particular bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, I am very proud of this moment that we have chosen as Members of the House to move forward legislation that addresses adaptive housing for veterans who have truly been heroic. I can't think of a single American who would stand in the way or would criticize Members of our body for addressing such an urgent need.

I want to congratulate all the Members who have done an even greater honor to the person for whom this bill is named by addressing issues related to the workstudy program, by increasing the availability of benefits to our veterans in their educational process.

Madam Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to join me in passing H.R. 3504, as amended, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SABLAN. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3504, which includes my bipartisan bill, the GI Bill Access to Career Credentials Act. The GI Bill Access to Career Credentials Act allow veterans to use their GI Bill benefits to cover the cost of approved preparatory courses for professional license and certification exams.

Covering these courses under the GI Bill will give veterans and their eligible family members greater ability to enter careers that require government-recognized licenses and certifications, such as in-demand careers in health and technology.

This is not the first time Congress has expanded GI bill benefit to cover non-tuition expenses. Over the last 75 years, we have broadened the GI bill to cover college admissions test fees, admissions test preparatory courses, and the exam fees for licenses and certifications.

And, while more than 5,700 GI Bill students over the last year and a half used their license and certification exam fees reimbursement benefit, the courses designed to help them pass these tests were not reimbursable. That makes no sense. Not all students pass these exams on the first attempt. If we really want to help our veterans become licensed and certified for demanding careers, let us help them prepare to pass the necessary tests.

Let us help them join the more than 25 million veterans and veteran family members who the GI Bill has helped achieve their educational and career goals.

My GI Bill Access to Career Credentials Act is supported by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, National Guard Association, Enlisted Association of the National Guard, AMVETS, National Military Family Association, Association of the U.S. Army, Military Order of the Purple Heart, Fleet Reserve Association, Reserve Officers Association and Paralyzed Veterans of America.

I ask my colleagues to support this measure, as well, and H.R. 3504 of which it is a part.

H.R. 3504 expands the VA's Specially Adapted Housing grant program to reach more veterans who need assistance and improves the Fry Scholarship program to cover more spouses and children of fallen servicemembers.

Again, I ask my colleagues to support H.R. 3504.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3504, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VENEZUELA TPS ACT OF 2019

Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 549) to designate Venezuela under section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to permit nationals of Venezuela to be eligible for temporary protected status under such section, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 549

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Venezuela TPS Act of 2019”.

SEC. 2. DESIGNATION FOR PURPOSES OF GRANTING TEMPORARY PROTECTED STATUS.

(a) DESIGNATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1254a), Venezuela shall be treated as if it had been designated under subsection (b)(1)(C) of that section, subject to the provisions of this section.

(2) PERIOD OF DESIGNATION.—The initial period of the designation referred to in paragraph (1) shall be for the 18-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) ALIENS ELIGIBLE.—As a result of the designation made under subsection (a), an alien who is a national of Venezuela is deemed to satisfy the requirements under paragraph (1) of section 244(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1254a(c)), subject to paragraph (3) of such section, if the alien—

(1) has been continuously physically present in the United States since the date of the enactment of this Act;

(2) is admissible as an immigrant, except as otherwise provided in paragraph (2)(A) of such section, and is not ineligible for temporary protected status under paragraph (2)(B) of such section; and

(3) registers for temporary protected status in a manner established by the Secretary of Homeland Security.

(c) CONSENT TO TRAVEL ABROAD.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall give prior consent to travel abroad, in accordance with section 244(f)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1254a(f)(3)), to an alien who is granted temporary protected status pursuant to the designation made under subsection (a) if the alien establishes to the satisfaction of the Secretary of Homeland Security that emergency and extenuating circumstances beyond the control of the alien require the alien to depart for a brief, temporary trip abroad.

(2) TREATMENT UPON RETURN.—An alien returning to the United States in accordance with an authorization described in paragraph (1) shall be treated as any other returning alien provided temporary protected status under section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1254a).

(d) FEE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In addition to any other fee authorized by law, the Secretary of Homeland Security is authorized to charge and collect a fee of \$360 for each application for temporary protected status under section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act by a person who is only eligible for such status by reason of subsection (a).

(2) WAIVER.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall permit aliens to apply for a waiver of any fees associated with filing an application referred to in paragraph (1).

SEC. 3. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled “Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation” for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CLINE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that

all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 549, the Venezuela TPS Act of 2019. This vitally important bill will provide help and support to those who cannot return to their home country of Venezuela.

Years-long political and economic turmoil in Venezuela has resulted in the world's fastest growing migration, staggering poverty, and chronic shortages of medicine. Millions of Venezuelans are malnourished, and the United Nations estimates that 7 million people are in need of humanitarian assistance. Four million Venezuelans have been forced from their home. Most have remained in the region in neighboring countries, but tens of thousands are here in the United States seeking refuge. It is long past time to grant temporary protected status for Venezuelans currently living in the United States.

My district has one of the largest Venezuelan populations in the Nation, and I understand very well the crisis in Venezuela.

I came to this country from Ecuador when I was 14 years old, having seen firsthand the damage that authoritarian and corrupt leaders in South America have caused their countries. I have good friends and family who are still there suffering in Maracaibo and in Caracas. They are desperate. I can hear it in their voices every time they update me on the crisis.

In Miami I have met with reporters who have had to flee their home because a free press does not exist in Venezuela. Just yesterday, more rolling blackouts hit the country jeopardizing the lives of hospital patients and sending the country into pure darkness.

Even if Nicolas Maduro, the leader of this brutal narco-regime, were to leave today and the legitimate President, Juan Guaido, were to be sworn in, extraordinary and temporary conditions exist that would prevent Venezuelans from returning safely. Maduro's regime has plunged Venezuela into catastrophe.

The poverty rate in Venezuela is soaring, and the nation's health system is near collapse. Just imagine, nearly one-third of Venezuelan physicians have fled the country, and an astounding 79 percent of hospitals are experiencing shortages in supplies to assist the country's mounting medical needs. This dire situation is only exacerbated by massive food and water shortages. Malnutrition is widespread, especially among children and pregnant women. Frequent nationwide blackouts con-

tribute to the deterioration of already impoverished communities. This is one of the worst humanitarian crises that we have seen in the Western Hemisphere.

One thing is clear: we have to help our Venezuelan brothers and sisters in the United States. These conditions in Venezuela warrant a designation of TPS, and through H.R. 549, Congress will take this necessary action.

I commend my colleagues, Representatives DARREN SOTO and MARIO DIAZ-BALART for introducing this bill. I thank Representatives DONNA SHALALA and DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Chairwoman LOFGREN of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Citizenship and Chairman NADLER of the Judiciary Committee for their support and hard work in helping move this bill forward.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the Venezuela TPS Act of 2019, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CLINE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, we stand in solidarity with the people of Venezuela, and I share many of the comments of the gentlewoman from Florida, but I must rise in opposition to H.R. 549.

H.R. 549 statutorily designates Venezuela for inclusion in the broken program known as Temporary Protective Status. Pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act, the Secretary of DHS can designate a country for TPS if there are circumstances that would prevent the safe return of aliens to that country or if a country is temporarily unable to adequately handle the return of its nationals.

When DHS does so, nationals of the designated country who are inside the United States on the date of the designation, whether legally or illegally, may apply to stay here and receive employment authorization. DHS has estimated there are 270,000 such Venezuelan nationals currently in the United States, over 100,000 of whom are here illegally.

TPS is usually initially designated for a period of 18 months and then redesignated in 18-month increments after the Secretary reviews the conditions in the country to determine whether the conditions for the initial TPS designation continue. If the Secretary determines the country no longer meets the conditions for the TPS designation, the Secretary is required by law to terminate the designation. There are currently over 415,000 TPS recipients from 10 different countries in the United States.

Despite the fact Congress intended TPS to be a temporary protection, over time it has become a permanent, automatically renewed status with some countries being designated for TPS for decades.

For instance, Honduras was initially designated for TPS back in 1999 due to Hurricane Mitch which struck the country in October of 1998. Somalia

was initially designated in September of 1991 based on armed conflict.

The current administration applied the law under section 244 of the INA regarding mandatory termination of TPS designation if the conditions no longer exist, and terminated TPS for Sudan, Nicaragua, Haiti, and El Salvador. The DHS Secretary gave those populations at least 12 months to wind down and prepare for departure, but a lawsuit was filed, and activist Federal courts issued an injunction.

I oppose H.R. 549, but do not do so lightly. There is no doubt that the people of Venezuela are suffering. They are in a dire situation as a result of the socialist policies of long-time President Hugo Chavez and his successor Nicolas Maduro.

□ 1745

But I hold out hope for a regime change in Venezuela, and I know the administration is watching this situation closely.

If Congress is, nevertheless, inclined to statutorily designate Venezuela for TPS, we should not do so without reforming the process to ensure renewal is not a rubber stamp; otherwise, we risk being in the same position we are currently in regarding other TPS designations. No other administration will terminate it, and 25 years from now, Members of Congress will call for green cards for Venezuelans here on TPS.

Another concern is two Federal circuits, the sixth and the ninth, have held the mere grant of TPS is an admission for purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act. The effect of those rulings is that TPS holders who were meant to be here temporarily can now get a green card pursuant to family or employment-based petition even if they entered the country illegally. Also problematic is the fact that the fee for a TPS application is statutorily capped at \$50.

Last week, the Immigration and Citizenship Subcommittee held a hearing regarding the long wait times for processing immigration benefits applications. Large volume is the biggest driver of longer processing times, but there is also not enough money to hire additional staff. Since it is a fee-funded agency, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services should be allowed to set the fee commensurate with the cost of application adjudication, which is obviously more than the mere \$50.

Lastly, I must point out the glaring hypocrisy of designating a country for temporary protective status after the majority recently passed H.R. 6, which created a green card path for 417,000 aliens in the country on temporary protected status. If the majority had its way, Congress would amend the INA to remove the word "temporary" from the TPS statute and just start handing over green cards immediately.

Madam Speaker, I oppose H.R. 549. I urge my colleagues to do the same, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the concerns Mr.

CLINE has brought up, but I would like to remind him that the Immigration and Nationality Act and this bill provide the authority to terminate TPS for Venezuelans, and Venezuelans, right now, are clearly eligible.

TPS was created specifically for the situations that we are seeing. TPS was created to address situations where extraordinary and temporary conditions in a country prevent its nationals from returning safely.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOTO), my colleague.

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Florida.

In 2016, Olyn Itriago escaped the evil Maduro tyranny in Venezuela. She received death threats, including a failed attempt on her life. Her brother, however, was captured and tortured by the Venezuelan National Guard. The crime? Supporting the opposition party.

Olyn is now one of my constituents in Orlando, with her daughters and her husband. She is active with our local groups, advocating for freedom in Venezuela. She holds on to hope of returning home one day soon.

Another one of my newest constituents, Selene Vargas, was diagnosed with cancer in 2017. Due to the shortages of medicine, food, and lack of functioning quality hospitals in Venezuela, all caused by Nicolas Maduro's destruction of the economy, she moved to Orlando to continue her cancer treatment. Selene hopes to beat cancer, return to Venezuela, and see her family again.

Like Olyn and Selene, hundreds of thousands of Venezuelans in the United States fear for their lives. They ask for our compassion until the horror ends. Our bipartisan Venezuela TPS Act would protect all eligible Venezuelan nationals from deportation. It allows them to contribute to our American economy, all while they continue to work to fix Venezuela.

The world is now witness to the ruthless oppression, starvation, and human rights abuses of Maduro's rule. The administration has been a loud voice condemning Maduro.

Vice President MIKE PENCE said, during a visit to Florida recently, that the White House is discussing TPS. Secretary of State Mike Pompeo also mentioned TPS protections could be decided "in the near future."

Today, the House has a chance to fulfill those promises. Senators MARCO RUBIO and BOB MENENDEZ are leading this bipartisan effort in the Senate as well.

Granting Venezuelans TPS is one of the most bipartisan immigration acts each of us as a Member of Congress can take right now. I plead with Members on both sides of the aisle to take this opportunity to come together to do the right thing.

It is our moral responsibility to support these brave Venezuelans and their families who are already citizens here

in the United States. This is the next step to helping the people and to restoring freedom and the rule of law in Venezuela.

Madam Speaker, I urge all my colleagues in the House to vote for the bill.

"For a free Venezuela," "Por una Venezuela libre."

Mr. CLINE. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART).

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Speaker, I first commend my colleague from central Florida (Mr. SOTO), for his leadership and his perseverance.

I want to also thank my colleagues from south Florida, many of whom are here today in support of this important piece of legislation.

Look, I know that there are concerns about an immigration system that is absolutely broken in this country, and it is. I know that there are concerns about even the TPS system. I get that. But we have to take a step back.

What we are dealing with here is a very specific, unique situation, which is why Congress today will have this opportunity to vote on it.

You know the situation. You have heard the situation about the humanitarian crisis in Venezuela. Over 3 million people have fled Venezuela because what was the wealthiest country in South America, because of the radical socialist policies of the two last dictatorships, now has become among the poorest, where people don't have access to any basic issues of—whether it is healthcare or even food, medicine.

You know all that, but, you see, there is something else: The extreme repression that is taking place in Venezuela, that is the real reason people are fleeing. That is the reason that Venezuelans are dying. That is the reason that the heroes in Venezuela have hit the streets. That is the reason why this young leader, President Guaido, has come to the forefront leading these heroic people.

And this administration has recognized that fact. This administration—and I am so grateful—has applied tough sanctions against the dictatorship, has shown great solidarity with the people of Venezuela.

So I ask you, let's not confuse this with all of the issues of immigration and the broken immigration system. Really, with what is going on in Venezuela, should we be sending Venezuelans back to that dictatorship, or could Congress act in a very specific circumstance to give them the ability to stay here, at least while this dictatorship, this horrific situation is taking place in Venezuela?

That is what we are dealing with. Not the horrors of complications or the messed up parts of the immigration system which has got issues, obviously. It is this very specific issue.

Again, thanking, particularly, my colleague, Mr. SOTO, I would just urge my colleagues in the House to take a step back. These are specific cir-

cumstances dealing with this dictatorship in Venezuela. The administration has shown solidarity, Congress now has the opportunity to do the same.

Madam Speaker, I ask for a "yes" vote.

Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ), my colleague.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to urge the House to pass the Venezuela TPS Act of 2019, which would grant Venezuelan nationals urgently needed temporary protective status in the United States of America.

The Maduro regime has perpetrated egregious human rights abuses, inflicting an economic and humanitarian crisis on the people of Venezuela. Venezuelans fleeing starvation, violence, and political persecution have sought refuge in the United States.

My district has the largest Venezuelan population in the U.S. So many of my south Florida neighbors know the brutality of the Maduro regime firsthand and fled here seeking safety.

The stories are heartbreaking: children kidnapped from playgrounds; family members dying of hunger, violence, and lack of medicine; individuals who were jailed for speaking out against the government; businesses confiscated.

Extending TPS will ensure Venezuelans are shielded from the imminent danger of deportation and can obtain work permits.

President Trump has called the Maduro regime a "nightmare of poverty, hunger, and death." He said in June that he was looking "very seriously at extending TPS to Venezuela."

But a recent letter from the USCIS stated the administration is simply "monitoring" the situation in Venezuela, something it has done for months.

There was no commitment to extend TPS to Venezuela, and in the meantime, this administration continues to deport Venezuelan nationals, sending them back to the nightmare of the Maduro regime.

This cannot wait any longer. It is past time we support the Venezuelan community and recognize the urgency of extending them TPS.

President Trump could grant TPS to Venezuelans today. He doesn't need congressional action. So amidst his inaction, the House of Representatives will take action today to protect our neighbors and friends, because their lives are on the line.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this legislation to ensure that Venezuelans are granted this essential protection, and I say "Vive Venezuela."

Mr. CLINE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Florida for her remarks and for her sharing the concerns of the president for the socialist regime of Maduro.

I would note that there are very few detained noncriminal Venezuelans with removal orders, and there is no mechanism currently in place for directly removing aliens to Venezuela.

Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Puerto Rico (Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN).

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 549, the Venezuela TPS Act, introduced by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOTO), my friend.

Madam Speaker, I am a proud cosponsor of this bill, essentially allowing Venezuelan nationals living in the United States to be eligible for temporary protected status. This status will extend travel authorization, allow lawful employment, and, ultimately, prevent their removal from the United States.

The crisis in Venezuela is dire.

In April, I had the opportunity to travel to Colombia with other Members of Congress to visit a humanitarian aid center on the border with Venezuela. I saw firsthand the appalling conditions that our Latin American brothers and sisters are enduring, and believe me, it is worse than anyone can imagine.

The hunger and the need experienced in the country are unprecedented and heartbreaking. Over 90 percent of the population is living in poverty; 7 million people need humanitarian assistance; and diseases that have been previously eradicated have, unfortunately, returned.

To make matters worse, there is a shortage of 85 percent of necessary medicines to treat those diseases on the ground, while infant mortality rates have increased by 30 percent and maternal mortality rates have increased by an alarming 60 percent.

This is unacceptable, Madam Speaker.

The main obstacle at hand lies in the hands of Nicolas Maduro and his ruthless dictatorship. He is holding the people of Venezuela hostage, depriving them of basic human rights.

Additionally, the number of Venezuelans migrating to Puerto Rico has doubled since the crisis began and can be expected to continue increasing as long as Maduro remains in power.

I will continue working to move this bill so that Venezuelans can have a temporary safe haven in our country, where they can live freely.

Madam Speaker, I do understand that the House needs to do something about this, and I urge my colleagues to do the same and support this bill.

Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. SHALALA), my colleague.

Ms. SHALALA. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this lifesaving bipartisan legislation to designate temporary protective status for Venezuelans.

Maduro's evil regime has plunged Venezuela into catastrophe. The once-thriving country is in free fall, with

Venezuelans now suffering from the largest economic, political, and humanitarian crisis in the entire hemisphere.

Just in 2018, nearly 30,000 Venezuelans applied for asylum in the United States, becoming the number one country of origin for asylum claimants.

□ 1800

Many Venezuelans have come to south Florida, where they have contributed so much to our diverse community. In my district, there are approximately 17,000 Venezuelan-born residents.

My constituents cannot safely return. A recent U.N. report detailed the shocking government abuses, including extrajudicial killings at the hands of Maduro's death squads.

Simply stated, granting TPS for Venezuelans is the right thing to do.

TPS has bipartisan support in the House and in the Senate. We now have an opportunity to take real action to support those who have fled the crisis caused by the illegitimate, inhumane Maduro regime.

Madam Speaker, I thank my Florida colleagues on both sides of the aisle, as well as our colleague from Puerto Rico (Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN), for their work on this important legislation. I strongly urge a "yes" vote.

Vive Venezuela.

Mr. CLINE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her remarks against the socialist regime of Maduro as well.

Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS).

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Madam Speaker, let's be clear: Venezuela is one of the most natural-resources-rich nations on the planet, and for oil, in the top five in reserves in the world.

The problem with Venezuela is not its people, other than that they made mistakes in whom they elected. The problem is not the lack of resources, which should empower those people to be wealthy. Rather, the problem in Venezuela is the self-inflicted adoption of socialism.

Let's be clear about the economic havoc that is now occurring in Venezuela. We have starvation. In one recent study, the average adult over a year's period of time had a weight loss in excess of 20 pounds because they could not get the calories needed to sustain their body weight. Riots have resulted.

Inflation a few years ago was over 1,000 percent. Today, we have estimates that inflation in Venezuela is as high as 10 million percent. Of course, the currency is worthless and becoming more so.

Venezuela, as a country, has been brought to its knees by the adoption of socialism. I find it ironic that so many in America now advocate the suppression of free enterprise and the liberty on which it is based, and the replace-

ment of free enterprise and liberty with socialism and the dictatorial nature that is inherent in the adoption of socialist practices. Venezuela is an excellent example of why America must never go socialist.

I want to emphasize one thing: While Maduro has been in charge of Venezuela, Maduro is not the cause of the economic hardship that is now being faced in Venezuela. Rather, it is the people's adoption of socialism.

Let's go to H.R. 549 and how it relates to what I have just said.

This bill proposes a tsunami of people coming to our country who are ill-equipped to support themselves.

Let's put that into the perspective of where we are as a nation. We just blew through the \$22 trillion debt mark earlier this year. This year, we are looking at a roughly \$900 billion deficit.

A deal has been reached that will only increase our deficit by \$2 trillion over the next 2 years, pushing our debt up to \$22 trillion. This is money we do not have, have to borrow to get, and can't afford to pay back.

How does that relate to H.R. 549? Well, let me share some numbers with you: Sixty percent of households with a lawful immigrant in them are on welfare, living off the hard work of others. Seventy percent of illegal alien households are on welfare, living off the hard work of others here in the United States of America.

Quite frankly, Madam Speaker, the United States of America can no longer afford to be the world's orphanage for children and adults alike. We have to get our own house in order, and this legislation helps to increase that disorder by increasing our deficit and debt, making it less manageable and further risking debilitating insolvency and the bankruptcy of a great Nation.

Madam Speaker, I ask for opposing H.R. 549, and that is how I will vote.

Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL. Madam Speaker, just a couple of quick responses to my colleague, Mr. BROOKS.

The only thing that I do agree with is, yes, we do have to put our own house in order. We have an executive in disarray at this moment.

I think that maybe the gentleman is ill-informed. The people of Venezuela did not elect the narco-regime, the authoritarian, dictatorial leader who is Nicolas Maduro. They had fraudulent elections in May 2018.

Please do not insult the people in Venezuela, who are suffering, who have no food, who have no access to medicine. We have seen the worst humanitarian crisis in this hemisphere, and it was not because Venezuelans elected him. Actually, he held fraudulent elections. The interim, legitimate President is Juan Guaido.

But we are not going to see a tsunami of Venezuelans coming to this country. This bill applies only and specifically to the Venezuelans who are already residing in the United States.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH), my colleague.

Mr. DEUTCH. Madam Speaker, I strongly support H.R. 549, the Venezuela TPS Act.

The situation in Venezuela is dire. It is outrageous, Madam Speaker, that some in this Chamber would blame the horrific situation in Venezuela on the people of Venezuela. It is the Maduro regime that is committing horrific human rights abuses.

People are being killed and tortured. The media has been censored. Opponents of the regime have been imprisoned. The economy is failing. Food is scarce. Essential medicines cannot be found.

The mass corruption and poverty have forced more than 4 million people to flee the country for their lives.

I have witnessed desperate Venezuelans crossing the border into Colombia in need of food. I spoke with families who traveled hours and hours to Cucuta for one meal for their children. I saw warehouses filled with food and humanitarian assistance that Maduro refuses to allow in to help his people.

The dreadful living conditions, extreme violence, and persecution warrant extending TPS to Venezuelans living in the United States.

We must stand with the Venezuelan people, the legitimate government of President Juan Guaido, and the return of freedom and democracy. For right now, passing this bill will ensure Venezuelans in the U.S. are protected from being deported to life-threatening conditions.

Madam Speaker, this bill will save lives. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Florida has 6 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Virginia has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. CLINE. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MURPHY), my colleague.

Mrs. MURPHY. Madam Speaker, I support this bipartisan bill to extend temporary protected status to Venezuela.

There are over 400,000 Venezuelans living in the United States, and more than half live in Florida. About 200,000 of these men and women would receive TPS if this bill becomes law. They could work legally, pay taxes, and contribute to our economy for a period of time, without living in fear of deportation.

Venezuela is in absolute crisis, and making Venezuelans in the U.S. go home right now is immoral. In many cases, it could be a death sentence.

Requiring people who have sought refuge in America to return to a failed state violates our core values as a nation.

Let me be clear: Passing TPS is a critical step, but it seeks to treat the

symptom of a disease rather than trying to cure the disease itself. The disease is the cruel, undemocratic, and incompetent regime of Nicolas Maduro.

For Venezuela to prosper and for the U.S. to protect its national security, the Maduro regime must go. America should work with its allies in the region and use all elements of our national power to support the Venezuelan patriots who are fighting to reclaim their country from the regime that has destroyed it.

Then, and only then, will Venezuela be sufficiently stable and safe so these proud Venezuelans can return to the country they love.

Mr. CLINE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As was said earlier, there are very few detained noncriminal Venezuelans with removal orders, and there is no mechanism currently in place for directly removing aliens to Venezuela.

Madam Speaker, we stand with the people of Venezuela in their fight against the socialist regime of Nicolas Maduro.

We recognize that only through change in leadership and a change in direction will Venezuela change course and begin to rebound, in terms of adopting economic reforms and abandoning the socialist policies of the Maduro regime.

We stand with the people, and we stand ready to embrace the newly elected President, should he take control of the country.

But this bill, H.R. 549, is a bill that is simply not appropriate for the circumstances right now. This broken TPS system that we have would not be sufficient to accommodate the hundreds of thousands of Venezuelans who would seek to use it.

Suffice it to say, it is similar to helping people by throwing them a raft full of holes.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against H.R. 549, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In response to Mr. CLINE's concern, once again, TPS is the law of the land. It is under section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. All we are asking is to place Venezuela as a country that is designated under TPS in this bill.

We are talking about people who are suffering. We cannot send them back to a humanitarian emergency.

We wrote a letter to the Trump administration, asking them to grant TPS for Venezuelans. They have the ability to do so at the administrative level right now, but they have refused. They say they are supportive of Venezuelans, but I seriously question that when they disagree with the importance of granting TPS for the thousands of Venezuelans living in this country today. We cannot send them back to a brutal regime, to a regime that is actually killing its own citizens.

I would like to express my support for H.R. 549. There is, as I mentioned, widespread poverty and shortages of food and water. The government is in disarray, and we can't wait any longer. We have to help our Venezuelan brothers and sisters in the United States, and this bill accomplishes just that.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support H.R. 549. We must do it, "lo tenemos que hacer." This is the moment.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 549, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

□ 1815

HONORING AMERICAN VETERANS IN EXTREME NEED ACT OF 2019

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2938) to exempt from the calculation of monthly income certain benefits paid by the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Department of Defense, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2938

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Honoring American Veterans in Extreme Need Act of 2019" or the "HAVEN Act".

SEC. 2. DEFINITION OF CURRENT MONTHLY INCOME.

Section 101(10A) of title 11, United States Code, is amended by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

"(B)(i) includes any amount paid by any entity other than the debtor (or in a joint case the debtor and the debtor's spouse), on a regular basis for the household expenses of the debtor or the debtor's dependents (and in a joint case the debtor's spouse if not otherwise a dependent); and

"(ii) excludes—

"(I) benefits received under the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 301 et seq.);

"(II) payments to victims of war crimes or crimes against humanity on account of their status as victims of such crimes;

"(III) payments to victims of international terrorism or domestic terrorism, as those terms are defined in section 2331 of title 18, on account of their status as victims of such terrorism; and

"(IV) any monthly compensation, pension, pay, annuity, or allowance paid under title

10, 37, or 38 in connection with a disability, combat-related injury or disability, or death of a member of the uniformed services, except that any retired pay excluded under this subclause shall include retired pay paid under chapter 61 of title 10 only to the extent that such retired pay exceeds the amount of retired pay to which the debtor would otherwise be entitled if retired under any provision of title 10 other than chapter 61 of that title.”.

SEC. 3. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled “Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation” for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CLAY). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CLINE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The overriding principle of the bankruptcy system is to give people who are overwhelmed with unmanageable debt a fresh start through meaningful financial relief.

The Bankruptcy Code, either directly or indirectly, affects millions of Americans, and all types of businesses, from large to small.

The system is supposed to work for everyone, from consumer debtors and small business owners, to family farmers, servicemembers, and veterans, and give them a new pathway to economic prosperity. But as we have heard during a recent oversight hearing held by the Subcommittee on Antitrust, Commercial, and Administrative Law, the bankruptcy system is not working.

In light of these concerns, the House Judiciary Committee unanimously passed four bipartisan pieces of legislation to address this concern. These include H.R. 2938, the Honoring American Veterans in Extreme Need Act of 2019, or the HAVEN Act. This legislation, which has been championed by my colleague on the committee, Congresswoman LUCY MCBATH, addresses a fundamental unfairness in current bankruptcy law that affects veterans receiving disability benefits.

Although Social Security benefits are not treated as income for purposes of the Bankruptcy Code’s means test, veterans’ disability benefits do con-

stitute income under this test, even though, much like Social Security, these benefits are a lifeline to many of its recipients and are otherwise protected from seizure by creditors.

By counting such benefits as income, many veterans become ineligible for the more immediate discharges available under Chapter 7 and, instead, they are steered into Chapter 13, which requires a debtor to make payments to creditors pursuant to a 3- to 5-year plan before he or she can receive a discharge.

H.R. 2938 corrects this obvious inequity. It would treat certain veterans’ disability benefits paid by the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Department of Defense the same as Social Security payments under the Bankruptcy Code’s means test.

I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I speak in support of the bill, and I want to thank the gentleman from Rhode Island for his leadership on this issue.

We should all honor and support America’s veterans and their families. The HAVEN Act does that by making sure disability and death benefits received by veterans and their families receive special protection during the difficult process of bankruptcy.

I also want to thank the gentleman from Georgia for her leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. MCBATH), the author of the legislation.

Mrs. MCBATH. Mr. Speaker, I am so pleased to bring the HAVEN Act to a vote on the House floor today; and I thank Chairman NADLER, our subcommittee chair; Mr. CICILLINE, my Republican cosponsor; Mr. STEUBE, and all the cosponsors who supported the expeditious passage of this bill. I want to thank the veterans and the advocates for putting their support behind this legislation as well.

I introduced the HAVEN Act to support veterans facing significant financial hardship. No one wants to turn to bankruptcy. It is a path toward debt relief that carries serious financial consequences.

But it is an important option for those with the most serious financial circumstances, and we must make sure our bankruptcy system is serving our veterans. These servicemembers deserve an opportunity to get back on their feet with dignity.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I would simply state that the HAVEN Act makes the Bankruptcy Code work better and more fairly for our Nation’s veterans and those who depend on them; so I encourage my colleagues to support the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to pass the HAVEN Act, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2938, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVISTS DEBT RELIEF EXTENSION ACT OF 2019

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3304) to exempt for an additional 4-year period, from the application of the means-test presumption of abuse under chapter 7, qualifying members of reserve components of the Armed Forces and members of the National Guard who, after September 11, 2001, are called to active duty or to perform a homeland defense activity for not less than 90 days, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3304

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “National Guard and Reservists Debt Relief Extension Act of 2019”.

SEC. 2. NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVISTS DEBT RELIEF AMENDMENT.

Section 4(b) of the National Guard and Reservists Debt Relief Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-438; 122 Stat. 5000) is amended by striking “11-year” and inserting “15-year”.

SEC. 3. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled “Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation” for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CLINE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Under current law, National Guard members and reservists who serve on active duty are, like other active-duty servicemembers, exempt from the Bankruptcy Code's means test, which determines whether a debtor's income is too high to have all of his or her debts erased in bankruptcy.

Unless otherwise exempted, servicemembers and veterans must complete the required forms and submit the specified paperwork to satisfy the Bankruptcy Code's means test.

This requirement even applies to servicemembers who have returned to the United States from active service and, thus, no longer receive combat pay. Under the means test, a servicemember must calculate his or her income based on the average monthly income that he or she received during the six months preceding the filing date of the bankruptcy case, rather than the debtor's actual income, which may be less because of the debtor's noncombat status.

H.R. 3304, the National Guard and Reservists Debt Relief Extension Act of 2019 responds to this concern. This legislation would extend for 4 years the temporary authorization exempting certain qualifying reserve component members of the Armed Services and National Guard members from the Bankruptcy Code's means test.

This critical protection for National Guard members and reservists must be extended before it expires at the end of the year. H.R. 3304 was unanimously passed out of the Judiciary Committee by voice vote.

I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of the bill and I want to thank the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN), the sponsor, for his support of this important legislation which would provide National Guard members, Armed Services reservists, and their families continued flexibility to qualify for greater debt relief in bankruptcy.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN), the sponsor of the bill.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, this is an important bill for reservists and National Guardsmen who protect our country in times of war. We are in the longest war of our Nation's history.

The bankruptcy bill of 2005 was a bad bill that made it more difficult for people to claim bankruptcy; hurt guardsmen and reservists whose bases are oftentimes surrounded by payday lenders, and they become subject to large loans in difficult times while in service, having to even file bankruptcy, let alone, respond to debts that they incur on behalf of the American people.

But I want to thank Mr. CLINE, a great American, and supporter of reservists and people serving our country, our National Guard and reservists. For being a cosponsor, Representative MADELEINE DEAN of Pennsylvania, and TIM BURCHETT, an outstanding Tennesseean and a volunteer for joining me in reintroducing this bill.

I would like to thank all the National Guard and reservists who protect us, both here and abroad.

I ask for unanimous passage.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to pass this important legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3304, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

SMALL BUSINESS REORGANIZATION ACT OF 2019

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3311) to amend chapter 11 of title 11, United States Code, to address reorganization of small businesses, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3311

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Small Business Reorganization Act of 2019".

SEC. 2. REORGANIZATION OF SMALL BUSINESS DEBTORS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 11 of title 11, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SUBCHAPTER V—SMALL BUSINESS DEBTOR REORGANIZATION

“§ 1181. Inapplicability of other sections

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Sections 105(d), 1101(1), 1104, 1105, 1106, 1107, 1108, 1115, 1116, 1121, 1123(a)(8), 1123(c), 1127, 1129(a)(15), 1129(b), 1129(c), 1129(e), and 1141(d)(5) of this title do not apply in a case under this subchapter.

“(b) COURT AUTHORITY.—Unless the court for cause orders otherwise, paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 1102(a) and sections 1102(b), 1103, and 1125 of this title do not apply in a case under this subchapter.

“(c) SPECIAL RULE FOR DISCHARGE.—If a plan is confirmed under section 1191(b) of this title, section 1141(d) of this title shall not apply, except as provided in section 1192 of this title.

“§ 1182. Definitions

“In this subchapter:

“(1) DEBTOR.—The term ‘debtor’ means a small business debtor.

“(2) DEBTOR IN POSSESSION.—The term ‘debtor in possession’ means the debtor, unless removed as debtor in possession under section 1185(a) of this title.

“§ 1183. Trustee

“(a) IN GENERAL.—If the United States trustee has appointed an individual under section 586(b) of title 28 to serve as standing trustee in cases under this subchapter, and if such individual qualifies as a trustee under section 322 of this title, then that individual shall serve as trustee in any case under this subchapter. Otherwise, the United States trustee shall appoint 1 disinterested person to serve as trustee in the case or the United States trustee may serve as trustee in the case, as necessary.

“(b) DUTIES.—The trustee shall—

“(1) perform the duties specified in paragraphs (2), (5), (6), (7), and (9) of section 704(a) of this title;

“(2) perform the duties specified in paragraphs (3), (4), and (7) of section 1106(a) of this title, if the court, for cause and on request of a party in interest, the trustee, or the United States trustee, so orders;

“(3) appear and be heard at the status conference under section 1188 of this title and any hearing that concerns—

“(A) the value of property subject to a lien;

“(B) confirmation of a plan filed under this subchapter;

“(C) modification of the plan after confirmation; or

“(D) the sale of property of the estate;

“(4) ensure that the debtor commences making timely payments required by a plan confirmed under this subchapter;

“(5) if the debtor ceases to be a debtor in possession, perform the duties specified in section 704(a)(8) and paragraphs (1), (2), and (6) of section 1106(a) of this title, including operating the business of the debtor;

“(6) if there is a claim for a domestic support obligation with respect to the debtor, perform the duties specified in section 704(c) of this title; and

“(7) facilitate the development of a consensual plan of reorganization.

“(c) TERMINATION OF TRUSTEE SERVICE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—If the plan of the debtor is confirmed under section 1191(a) of this title, the service of the trustee in the case shall terminate when the plan has been substantially consummated, except that the United States trustee may reappoint a trustee as needed for performance of duties under subsection (b)(3)(C) of this section and section 1185(a) of this title.

“(2) SERVICE OF NOTICE OF SUBSTANTIAL CONSUMMATION.—Not later than 14 days after the plan of the debtor is substantially consummated, the debtor shall file with the court and serve on the trustee, the United States trustee, and all parties in interest notice of such substantial consummation.

“§ 1184. Rights and powers of a debtor in possession

“Subject to such limitations or conditions as the court may prescribe, a debtor in possession shall have all the rights, other than the right to compensation under section 330 of this title, and powers, and shall perform all functions and duties, except the duties specified in paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) of section 1106(a) of this title, of a trustee serving in a case under this chapter, including operating the business of the debtor.

“§ 1185. Removal of debtor in possession

“(a) IN GENERAL.—On request of a party in interest, and after notice and a hearing, the court shall order that the debtor shall not be

a debtor in possession for cause, including fraud, dishonesty, incompetence, or gross mismanagement of the affairs of the debtor, either before or after the date of commencement of the case, or for failure to perform the obligations of the debtor under a plan confirmed under this subchapter.

“(b) REINSTATEMENT.—On request of a party in interest, and after notice and a hearing, the court may reinstate the debtor in possession.

“§ 1186. Property of the estate

“(a) INCLUSIONS.—If a plan is confirmed under section 1191(b) of this title, property of the estate includes, in addition to the property specified in section 541 of this title—

“(1) all property of the kind specified in that section that the debtor acquires after the date of commencement of the case but before the case is closed, dismissed, or converted to a case under chapter 7, 12, or 13 of this title, whichever occurs first; and

“(2) earnings from services performed by the debtor after the date of commencement of the case but before the case is closed, dismissed, or converted to a case under chapter 7, 12, or 13 of this title, whichever occurs first.

“(b) DEBTOR REMAINING IN POSSESSION.—Except as provided in section 1185 of this title, a plan confirmed under this subchapter, or an order confirming a plan under this subchapter, the debtor shall remain in possession of all property of the estate.

“§ 1187. Duties and reporting requirements of debtors

“(a) FILING REQUIREMENTS.—Upon electing to be a debtor under this subchapter, the debtor shall file the documents required by subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 1116(1) of this title.

“(b) OTHER APPLICABLE PROVISIONS.—A debtor, in addition to the duties provided in this title and as otherwise required by law, shall comply with the requirements of section 308 and paragraphs (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), and (7) of section 1116 of this title.

“(c) SEPARATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT EXEMPTION.—If the court orders under section 1181(b) of this title that section 1125 of this title applies, section 1125(f) of this title shall apply.

“§ 1188. Status conference

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), not later than 60 days after the entry of the order for relief under this chapter, the court shall hold a status conference to further the expeditious and economical resolution of a case under this subchapter.

“(b) EXCEPTION.—The court may extend the period of time for holding a status conference under subsection (a) if the need for an extension is attributable to circumstances for which the debtor should not justly be held accountable.

“(c) REPORT.—Not later than 14 days before the date of the status conference under subsection (a), the debtor shall file with the court and serve on the trustee and all parties in interest a report that details the efforts the debtor has undertaken and will undertake to attain a consensual plan of reorganization.

“§ 1189. Filing of the plan

“(a) WHO MAY FILE A PLAN.—Only the debtor may file a plan under this subchapter.

“(b) DEADLINE.—The debtor shall file a plan not later than 90 days after the order for relief under this chapter, except that the court may extend the period if the need for the extension is attributable to circumstances for which the debtor should not justly be held accountable.

“§ 1190. Contents of plan

“A plan filed under this subchapter—

“(1) shall include—

“(A) a brief history of the business operations of the debtor;

“(B) a liquidation analysis; and

“(C) projections with respect to the ability of the debtor to make payments under the proposed plan of reorganization;

“(2) shall provide for the submission of all or such portion of the future earnings or other future income of the debtor to the supervision and control of the trustee as is necessary for the execution of the plan; and

“(3) notwithstanding section 1123(b)(5) of this title, may modify the rights of the holder of a claim secured only by a security interest in real property that is the principal residence of the debtor if the new value received in connection with the granting of the security interest was—

“(A) not used primarily to acquire the real property; and

“(B) used primarily in connection with the small business of the debtor.

“§ 1191. Confirmation of plan

“(a) TERMS.—The court shall confirm a plan under this subchapter only if all of the requirements of section 1129(a), other than paragraph (15) of that section, of this title are met.

“(b) EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding section 510(a) of this title, if all of the applicable requirements of section 1129(a) of this title, other than paragraphs (8), (10), and (15) of that section, are met with respect to a plan, the court, on request of the debtor, shall confirm the plan notwithstanding the requirements of such paragraphs if the plan does not discriminate unfairly, and is fair and equitable, with respect to each class of claims or interests that is impaired under, and has not accepted, the plan.

“(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—For purposes of this section, the condition that a plan be fair and equitable with respect to each class of claims or interests includes the following requirements:

“(1) With respect to a class of secured claims, the plan meets the requirements of section 1129(b)(2)(A) of this title.

“(2) As of the effective date of the plan—

“(A) the plan provides that all of the projected disposable income of the debtor to be received in the 3-year period, or such longer period not to exceed 5 years as the court may fix, beginning on the date that the first payment is due under the plan will be applied to make payments under the plan; or

“(B) the value of the property to be distributed under the plan in the 3-year period, or such longer period not to exceed 5 years as the court may fix, beginning on the date on which the first distribution is due under the plan is not less than the projected disposable income of the debtor.

“(3)(A)(i) The debtor will be able to make all payments under the plan; or

“(ii) there is a reasonable likelihood that the debtor will be able to make all payments under the plan; and

“(B) the plan provides appropriate remedies, which may include the liquidation of nonexempt assets, to protect the holders of claims or interests in the event that the payments are not made.

“(d) DISPOSABLE INCOME.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘disposable income’ means the income that is received by the debtor and that is not reasonably necessary to be expended—

“(1) for—

“(A) the maintenance or support of the debtor or a dependent of the debtor; or

“(B) a domestic support obligation that first becomes payable after the date of the filing of the petition; or

“(2) for the payment of expenditures necessary for the continuation, preservation, or operation of the business of the debtor.

“(e) SPECIAL RULE.—Notwithstanding section 1129(a)(9)(A) of this title, a plan that provides for the payment through the plan of a claim of a kind specified in paragraph (2) or (3) of section 507(a) of this title may be confirmed under subsection (b) of this section.

“§ 1192. Discharge

“If the plan of the debtor is confirmed under section 1191(b) of this title, as soon as practicable after completion by the debtor of all payments due within the first 3 years of the plan, or such longer period not to exceed 5 years as the court may fix, unless the court approves a written waiver of discharge executed by the debtor after the order for relief under this chapter, the court shall grant the debtor a discharge of all debts provided in section 1141(d)(1)(A) of this title, and all other debts allowed under section 503 of this title and provided for in the plan, except any debt—

“(1) on which the last payment is due after the first 3 years of the plan, or such other time not to exceed 5 years fixed by the court; or

“(2) of the kind specified in section 523(a) of this title.

“§ 1193. Modification of plan

“(a) MODIFICATION BEFORE CONFIRMATION.—The debtor may modify a plan at any time before confirmation, but may not modify the plan so that the plan as modified fails to meet the requirements of sections 1122 and 1123 of this title, with the exception of subsection (a)(8) of such section 1123. After the modification is filed with the court, the plan as modified becomes the plan.

“(b) MODIFICATION AFTER CONFIRMATION.—If a plan has been confirmed under section 1191(a) of this title, the debtor may modify the plan at any time after confirmation of the plan and before substantial consummation of the plan, but may not modify the plan so that the plan as modified fails to meet the requirements of sections 1122 and 1123 of this title, with the exception of subsection (a)(8) of such section 1123. The plan, as modified under this subsection, becomes the plan only if circumstances warrant the modification and the court, after notice and a hearing, confirms the plan as modified under section 1191(a) of this title.

“(c) CERTAIN OTHER MODIFICATIONS.—If a plan has been confirmed under section 1191(b) of this title, the debtor may modify the plan at any time within 3 years, or such longer time not to exceed 5 years, as fixed by the court, but may not modify the plan so that the plan as modified fails to meet the requirements of section 1191(b) of this title. The plan as modified under this subsection becomes the plan only if circumstances warrant such modification and the court, after notice and a hearing, confirms such plan, as modified, under section 1191(b) of this title.

“(d) HOLDERS OF A CLAIM OR INTEREST.—If a plan has been confirmed under section 1191(a) of this title, any holder of a claim or interest that has accepted or rejected the plan is deemed to have accepted or rejected, as the case may be, the plan as modified, unless, within the time fixed by the court, such holder changes the previous acceptance or rejection of the holder.

“§ 1194. Payments

“(a) RETENTION AND DISTRIBUTION BY TRUSTEE.—Payments and funds received by the trustee shall be retained by the trustee until confirmation or denial of confirmation of a plan. If a plan is confirmed, the trustee shall distribute any such payment in accordance with the plan. If a plan is not confirmed, the trustee shall return any such payments to the debtor after deducting—

“(1) any unpaid claim allowed under section 503(b) of this title;

“(2) any payment made for the purpose of providing adequate protection of an interest in property due to the holder of a secured claim; and

“(3) any fee owing to the trustee.

“(b) OTHER PLANS.—If a plan is confirmed under section 1191(b) of this title, except as otherwise provided in the plan or in the order confirming the plan, the trustee shall make payments to creditors under the plan.

“(c) PAYMENTS PRIOR TO CONFIRMATION.—Prior to confirmation of a plan, the court, after notice and a hearing, may authorize the trustee to make payments to the holder of a secured claim for the purpose of providing adequate protection of an interest in property.

“§ 1195. Transactions with professionals

“Notwithstanding section 327(a) of this title, a person is not disqualified for employment under section 327 of this title, by a debtor solely because that person holds a claim of less than \$10,000 that arose prior to commencement of the case.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of subchapters at the beginning of chapter 11 of title 11, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SUBCHAPTER V—SMALL BUSINESS DEBTOR REORGANIZATION

“1181. Inapplicability of other sections.

“1182. Definitions.

“1183. Trustee.

“1184. Rights and powers of a debtor in possession.

“1185. Removal of debtor in possession.

“1186. Property of the estate.

“1187. Duties and reporting requirements of debtors.

“1188. Status conference.

“1189. Filing of the plan.

“1190. Contents of plan.

“1191. Confirmation of plan.

“1192. Discharge.

“1193. Modification of plan.

“1194. Payments.

“1195. Transactions with professionals.”

SEC. 3. PREFERENCES; VENUE OF CERTAIN PROCEEDINGS.

(a) PREFERENCES.—Section 547(b) of title 11, United States Code, is amended by inserting “, based on reasonable due diligence in the circumstances of the case and taking into account a party’s known or reasonably knowable affirmative defenses under subsection (c),” after “may”.

(b) VENUE OF CERTAIN PROCEEDINGS.—Section 1409(b) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking “\$10,000” and inserting “\$25,000”.

SEC. 4. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) TITLE 11.—Title 11, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 101—

(A) in paragraph (51C), by inserting “and has not elected that subchapter V of chapter 11 of this title shall apply” after “is a small business debtor”; and

(B) in paragraph (51D)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by striking “or operating real property or activities incidental thereto” and inserting “single asset real estate”; and

(II) by striking “for a case in which” and all that follows and inserting “not less than 50 percent of which arose from the commercial or business activities of the debtor; and”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon;

(II) by striking “does not include any member” and inserting the following: “does not include—

“(i) any member”; and

(III) by adding at the end the following:

“(ii) any debtor that is a corporation subject to the reporting requirements under section 13 or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78m, 78o(d)); or

“(iii) any corporation that—

“(I) is subject to the reporting requirements under section 13 or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78m, 78o(d)); and

“(II) is an affiliate of a debtor.”;

(2) in section 103—

(A) by redesignating subsections (i) through (k) as subsections (j) through (l), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after subsection (h) the following:

“(i) Subchapter V of chapter 11 of this title applies only in a case under chapter 11 in which a small business debtor elects that subchapter V of chapter 11 shall apply.”;

(3) in section 322(a), by inserting “1183,” after “1163.”;

(4) in section 326—

(A) in subsection (a), by inserting “, other than a case under subchapter V of chapter 11” after “7 or 11”; and

(B) in subsection (b), by inserting “subchapter V of chapter 11 or” after “In a case under”;

(5) in section 347—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) by inserting “1194,” after “726.”; and

(ii) by inserting “subchapter V of chapter 11,” after “chapter 7.”; and

(B) in subsection (b), by inserting “1194,” after “1173.”;

(6) in section 363(c)(1), by inserting “1183, 1184,” after “1108.”;

(7) in section 364(a), by inserting “1183, 1184,” after “1108.”;

(8) in section 523(a), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting “1192” after “1141.”;

(9) in section 524—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) in paragraph (1), by inserting “1192,” after “1141.”; and

(ii) in paragraph (3), by inserting “1192,” after “523.”;

(B) in subsection (c)(1), by inserting “1192,” after “1141.”; and

(C) in subsection (d), by inserting “1192,” after “1141.”;

(10) in section 557(d)(3), by inserting “1183,” after “1104.”;

(11) in section 1102(a), by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

“(3) Unless the court for cause orders otherwise, a committee of creditors may not be appointed in a small business case or a case under subchapter V of this chapter.”; and

(12) in section 1146(a), by inserting “or 1191” after “1129”.

(b) TITLE 28.—Title 28 United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 586—

(A) in subsection (a)(3), by inserting “(including subchapter V of chapter 11)” after “7, 11”;

(B) in subsection (b), by inserting “subchapter V of chapter 11 or” after “cases under” the first place it appears;

(C) in subsection (d)(1), by inserting “subchapter V of chapter 11 or” after “cases under” each place that term appears; and

(D) in subsection (e)—

(i) in paragraph (1), by inserting “subchapter V of chapter 11 or” after “cases under”;

(ii) in paragraph (2), by inserting “subchapter V of chapter 11 or” after “cases under” each place that term appears; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(5) In the event that the services of the trustee in a case under subchapter V of chapter 11 of title 11 are terminated by dismissal or conversion of the case, or upon substantial consummation of a plan under section

1183(c)(1) of that title, the court shall award compensation to the trustee consistent with services performed by the trustee and the limits on the compensation of the trustee established pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subsection.”;

(2) in section 589b—

(A) in subsection (a)(1), by inserting “subchapter V of chapter 11 and” after “cases under”; and

(B) in subsection (d)—

(i) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting “subchapter V of chapter 11 and” after “trustees under”; and

(ii) in the undesignated matter following paragraph (8), by inserting “subchapter V of chapter 11 and” after “cases under”; and

(3) in section 1930(a)(6)(A), by inserting “, other than under subchapter V,” after “chapter 11 of title 11”.

SEC. 5. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 6. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled “Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation” for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. VICILLINE) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CLINE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. VICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. VICILLINE. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 3311, the Small Business Reorganization Act of 2019, is legislation that I introduced with the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CLINE), to make a series of reforms to current bankruptcy law, which would streamline the financial reorganization of small businesses.

Small, locally-owned businesses are the economic lifeblood of our communities. But according to the Small Business Administration, only about 20 percent of small businesses survive after their first year.

It is essential that our bankruptcy system does not punish entrepreneurship and investment by foreclosing opportunities for small businesses to financially reorganize.

This gap in the Bankruptcy Code is primarily due to the fact that this process was designed with large, complex corporations in mind, and does not include adequate protections or safeguards for small businesses.

H.R. 3311 addresses this shortcoming by requiring the appointment of a

trustee to monitor these cases and giving cases greater flexibility to approve small business reorganization plans in a fair and equitable manner.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3311, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of the bill. I want to thank the gentleman from Rhode Island for his leadership on this issue.

The bankruptcy system is a critical component of our economy. It provides an important step, an important safety net for households and entrepreneurs when they need a fresh start. It also stabilizes and encourages lending, because it is a tried-and-true way for creditors to recover as much as feasible when things go wrong for borrowers.

It is particularly important that the Bankruptcy Code work for small businesses. Small business owners are the backbone of communities across our country. It is their risk-taking that drives the creation of new jobs in America. When they need the Bankruptcy Code's help to reorganize their debts and keep their businesses going, the Bankruptcy Code should be there as a tool to help them.

That is why I am particularly happy that the House today considers the Small Business Reorganization Act. This important bill offers long-needed reform of Chapter 11 in the Bankruptcy Code to help small businesses, and I am proud to introduce it, along with Chairman CICILLINE.

I want to thank the full committee chairman, Chairman NADLER, and Ranking Member, Mr. COLLINS, for their support for this legislation and for being original cosponsors this term.

Mr. Speaker, this bill promises to finally make Chapter 11 work for the entrepreneurs whose small businesses are critical to life in communities across this Nation, and I encourage all my colleagues to support the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I am proud to have introduced H.R. 3311, the Small Business Reorganization Act of 2019 with the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CLINE), and I thank him for his strong leadership on this issue, as well as the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS).

This bipartisan legislation was unanimously approved by the Judiciary Committee and will address gaps in our bankruptcy system to provide financial relief to small businesses.

This legislation is supported by the nonpartisan National Bankruptcy Conference, as well as the American Bankruptcy Institute. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to pass H.R. 3311.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3311, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1830

LET EVERYONE GET INVOLVED IN OPPORTUNITIES FOR NATIONAL SERVICE ACT

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 504) to amend title 36, United States Code, to authorize The American Legion to determine the requirements for membership in The American Legion, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 504

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Let Everyone Get Involved in Opportunities for National Service Act" or the "LEGION Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND SENSE OF CONGRESS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Since the end of World War II, the Federal Government has designated specific periods of war, the dates of which are important for qualification for certain benefits or membership in veterans organizations established by Congress.

(2) In between those recognized periods of war, during so-called peacetime eras, the United States military has been involved in not fewer than 12 known eras, which are unrecognized by the United States Government as periods of war, resulting in numerous United States personnel combat casualties.

(3) Those 12 unrecognized war eras occurred at the direction of the then President of the United States, with full knowledge and consent of the then Congress.

(4) The first of those 12 unrecognized war eras involving active United States military personnel was the Greek Civil War, fought in Greece from 1946 to 1949 between the army of the Government of Greece, supported by active military personal of the United States and the United Kingdom, and the Democratic Army of Greece, the military branch of the Communist Party of Greece.

(5) During the Greek Civil War, one member of the Armed Forces of the United States sacrificed his life in service to the United States, and five others suffered non-combat deaths.

(6) The second of those unrecognized war eras involving active United States military personnel was the Chinese Civil War, which occurred during the aftermath of World War II.

(7) During the Chinese Civil War, the United States military equipped, trained, transported, and supplied the Kuomintang-led Government of the Republic of China with approximately \$4,430,000,000 in its resistance to the Communist Party of China.

(8) During the Chinese Civil War, 14 members of the Armed Forces of the United States sacrificed their lives in service to the United States, 150 non-combatants of the United States lost their lives in the war, and 51 were wounded, resulting in 215 United States military casualties.

(9) The third unrecognized war era involving active United States military personnel is known as the Cold War.

(10) The Cold War was a period spanning from approximately 1947 until 1991 when the Soviet Union collapsed.

(11) Although no direct large-scale military fighting occurred between the militaries of the United States and the Soviet Union, active United States military personnel served in multiple regional conflicts during the Cold War, resulting in the deaths of not fewer than 32 members of the Armed Forces who sacrificed their lives in service to the United States and not fewer than 12 additional casualties.

(12) The fourth unrecognized war era involving active United States military personnel is known as the China Cold War.

(13) The China Cold War started when the Kuomintang-led Government of the Republic of China retreated to the island of Taiwan and lasted until 1972, after President Richard Nixon conducted a landmark state visit to China.

(14) During the military operations of the China Cold War, not fewer than 16 members of the Armed Forces of the United States sacrificed their lives in service to the United States.

(15) The fifth unrecognized war era involving active United States military personnel was the Lebanon Crisis of 1958, which involved more than 14,000 United States personnel and resulted in the death of one member of the Armed Forces who sacrificed his life in service to the United States and five non-combat deaths.

(16) The sixth unrecognized war era involving active United States military personnel was the Bay of Pigs invasion in April 1961.

(17) The Bay of Pigs invasion was a failed military invasion of Cuba undertaken by a United States military group sponsored by the Central Intelligence Agency that resulted in not fewer than one death of a member of the Armed Forces who sacrificed his life in service to the United States and 19 non-combat deaths.

(18) The seventh unrecognized war era involving active United States military personnel was the Cuban Missile Crisis, which took place between October 16 and October 28, 1962.

(19) The Cuban Missile Crisis directly related to homeland protection against the deployment of a Soviet ballistic missile in Cuba.

(20) During the Cuban Missile Crisis, one member of the Armed Forces sacrificed his life in service to the United States and 19 others died as non-combatants.

(21) The eighth unrecognized war era involving active United States military personnel was the Dominican Civil War in 1965.

(22) Operations during the Dominican Civil War resulted in the deaths of 27 members of the Armed Forces who sacrificed their lives in service to the United States, 20 non-combat-related deaths, and 283 wounded.

(23) The ninth unrecognized war era involving active United States military personnel was the Iran Hostage Crisis, which lasted from November 4, 1979, through January 20, 1981.

(24) The Iran Hostage Crisis involved military intervention by the United States which resulted in the deaths of 8 members of the Armed Forces who sacrificed their lives in service to United States.

(25) The tenth unrecognized war era involving active United States military personnel was the Salvadoran Civil War.

(26) The Salvadoran Civil War lasted more than 12 years, through the terms of two Presidential administrations of the United States, and resulted in the deaths of 22 members of the Armed Forces who sacrificed their lives in service to the United States, 15 non-combat deaths, and 35 other casualties.

(27) The 11th unrecognized war era involving active United States military personnel started on April 5, 1986, when the La Belle discotheque in West Berlin, Germany, was bombed, killing two United States soldiers and wounding 79 other members of the Armed Forces, which triggered what became known as the Libyan Conflict.

(28) The military operations of the Libyan Conflict included numerous air strikes by United States military forces and resulted in the deaths of two members of the Armed Forces who sacrificed their lives in service to the United States.

(29) The Libyan Conflict led to the 12th unrecognized war era involving active United States military personnel, known collectively as the Persian Gulf Conflicts, which lasted from July 24, 1987, through September 26, 1988.

(30) The Persian Gulf Conflicts involved United States military missions to protect Kuwaiti-owned oil tankers which represented the largest United States naval convoy operation since World War II.

(31) The Persian Gulf Conflicts resulted in numerous military operations and the deaths of not fewer than 39 members of the Armed Forces who sacrificed their lives in service to the United States and 31 wounded.

(32) Since the armistice that ended the hostilities of the Korean War on January 31, 1955, nearly 100 active United States military personnel have sacrificed their lives in service to the United States in South Korea, and more than 132 people of the United States have been wounded in-country.

(33) Since January 1, 1947, through all of the unrecognized war eras involving active United States military personnel, not fewer than 778 combat and non-combat members of the Armed Forces have sacrificed their lives in service to the United States and not fewer than 797 have been wounded.

(34) Since January 1, 1947, the unrecognized war eras involving active United States military personnel who were wounded and killed serving their country were administered under orders from the commander in chief and with the consent of Congress, proving that the United States has been conducting deadly wartime service to protect the country consistently since December 7, 1941.

(35) Eligibility for membership in The American Legion is determined by Congress through the establishment of specific dates of declared and officially recognized hostilities in which United States military personnel are on active service.

(36) The American Legion provides invaluable services to its members and supports the community of veterans who sacrificed in service of the United States.

(37) Membership in The American Legion allows veterans to engage in public service activities, such as supporting Boys and Girls State and Nation, youth mentorship programs, and benefit assistance, career fairs, and employment assistance for veterans.

(38) The American Legion has gone on record as supporting the 12 unrecognized war eras involving active United States military personnel since the beginning of World War II.

(39) The American Legion has aided, assisted, and comforted the families of the men and women who were called to serve or volunteered to serve during all of the unrecognized war eras and continues to provide support to veterans of those eras.

(40) The American Legion has commended the heroic actions of all military personnel who risked their lives in defense of freedom during each of the unrecognized war eras involving active United States military personnel.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that, in accordance with the his-

tory, tradition, and purposes of The American Legion, it is fair, proper, and reasonable that the privilege of membership in The American Legion should be extended to all military personnel who served on active military duty during all of the unrecognized war eras involving active United States military personnel.

SEC. 3. ELIGIBILITY FOR MEMBERSHIP IN THE AMERICAN LEGION.

Section 21703 of title 36, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “during any period from—” and all that follows through the end of clause (vii) and inserting the following: “during—

“(i) the period from April 6, 1917, through November 11, 1918; or

“(ii) any time after December 7, 1941; or”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by inserting “or time” after “a period”; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by inserting “or time” after “that period”.

SEC. 4. NONDISCRIMINATION WITH RESPECT TO THE REQUIREMENTS FOR HOLDING A STAFF POSITION IN THE AMERICAN LEGION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 217 of title 36, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 21704 the following new section:

“§ 21704A. Nondiscrimination

“The requirements for holding a staff position in the corporation may not discriminate on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 21704 the following new item: “21704A. Nondiscrimination.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. CORREA) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CLINE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 504, the Let Everyone Get Involved Opportunities for National Service Act, or the LEGION Act. This bipartisan bill will expand the eligibility for American Legion membership to include honorably discharged veterans who have served in unrecognized conflicts.

The American Legion was chartered by Congress in 1919. Since then, The American Legion has grown to become the Nation's largest veteran service organization, with more than 2 million members. In Orange County alone, The American Legion is home to nearly 8,000 members.

For millions of veterans The Legion has offered a community of support. Sadly, not all veterans are eligible to

join The American Legion. Currently, only veterans who serve during periods of declared hostilities are eligible.

Over the past decades, military personnel have served during at least 12 unofficial combat operations. They also deserve to be members of The Legion, and this bill will allow veterans who have honorably served in our Armed Forces during the Cuban Missile Crisis, the Libyan conflict, and other recognized conflicts to join The Legion.

I urge my House colleagues to support this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of S. 504, the LEGION Act, and I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from California, for his leadership on this issue. I am proud to stand here today in support of our Nation's veterans.

One hundred years ago, Congress chartered The American Legion because it recognized, as our veterans returned home from World War I, we must provide for them. The American Legion has advocated for our veterans, servicemembers, and their communities ever since.

In the last century, The American Legion has grown to nearly 2 million members around the world. The group is headquartered in Indianapolis, Indiana, and has 13,000 offices, including one in every State, advocating to State and Federal officials.

The American Legion now provides thousands of dollars in scholarships to help students attend college, and grants for the study, prevention, and treatment of various diseases.

They have also been at the forefront of the fight to improve mental health services for all, but particularly for our troops who struggle as they return home.

Beyond The American Legion's rich national history, it has held a special place in my home State of Virginia for many decades. The American Legion Department of Virginia was also chartered in 1919, with 91 local posts and several thousand members. In the intervening century, it has grown to 212 posts and over 33,000 Legionnaires, and it provides a variety of services to veterans and their families.

Today's legislation makes necessary amendments to The American Legion charter to include all existing members and opens it to all future members of the Armed Forces who are honorably discharged, separated, or continue to serve. It provides future flexibility to enable The American Legion to continue to provide opportunities for our servicemen and -women. It also enables The American Legion to serve the next generation.

I would like to thank Congressman CORREA again for his partnership on this legislation and his support of The American Legion and our servicemen and -women.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for their support of this process, and, once again, I ask for their support of this legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CORREA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 504.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. DELBENE). Proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed. Votes will be taken in the following order:

Motions to suspend the rules and

Agree to H. Res. 246;

Pass H.R. 549;

Pass H.R. 3304; and

Agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

OPPOSING GLOBAL BOYCOTT, DIVESTMENT, AND SANCTIONS MOVEMENT TARGETING ISRAEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 246) opposing efforts to delegitimize the State of Israel and the Global Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions Movement targeting Israel, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 398, nays 17, answered "present" 5, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 497]

YEAS—398

Adams	Bera	Brown (MD)
Aderholt	Bergman	Brownley (CA)
Aguilar	Beyer	Buchanan
Allen	Biggs	Buck
Allred	Bilirakis	Bucshon
Amodel	Bishop (GA)	Budd
Arrington	Bishop (UT)	Burchett
Axne	Blunt Rochester	Burgess
Babin	Bonamici	Bustos
Bacon	Bost	Butterfield
Baird	Boyle, Brendan	Byrne
Balderson	F.	Calvert
Banks	Brady	Carbajal
Barr	Brindisi	Cárdenas
Barragán	Brooks (AL)	Carter (GA)
Beatty	Brooks (IN)	Carter (TX)

Cartwright	Guest	McGovern
Case	Guthrie	McHenry
Casten (IL)	Haaland	McKinley
Castor (FL)	Hagedorn	McNerney
Castro (TX)	Harder (CA)	Meadows
Chabot	Harris	Meeks
Cheney	Hartzer	Meng
Chu, Judy	Hastings	Meuser
Cicilline	Hayes	Miller
Cisneros	Heck	Mitchell
Clark (MA)	Hern, Kevin	Moolenaar
Clarke (NY)	Herrera Beutler	Mooney (WV)
Clay	Hice (GA)	Morelle
Cleaver	Higgins (LA)	Mucarsel-Powell
Cline	Higgins (NY)	Mullin
Cloud	Hill (AR)	Murphy
Clyburn	Hill (CA)	Nadler
Cohen	Himes	Napolitano
Cole	Holding	Neal
Collins (GA)	Hollingsworth	Neguse
Collins (NY)	Horn, Kendra S.	Newhouse
Comer	Horsford	Norcross
Conaway	Houlahan	Norman
Connolly	Hoyer	Nunes
Cook	Hudson	O'Halleran
Cooper	Huizenga	Olson
Correa	Hunter	Palazzo
Costa	Hurd (TX)	Pallone
Courtney	Jackson Lee	Palmer
Cox (CA)	Jeffries	Panetta
Craig	Johnson (LA)	Pappas
Crawford	Johnson (OH)	Pascarell
Crenshaw	Johnson (SD)	Payne
Crist	Johnson (TX)	Pence
Crow	Jordan	Perlmutter
Cuellar	Joyce (OH)	Perry
Cummings	Joyce (PA)	Peters
Cunningham	Kaptur	Peterson
Curtis	Katko	Phillips
Dauids (KS)	Keating	Porter
Davidson (OH)	Keller	Posey
Davis (CA)	Kelly (IL)	Pressley
Davis, Rodney	Kelly (MS)	Price (NC)
Dean	Kelly (PA)	Quigley
DeFazio	Kennedy	Raskin
DeGette	Khanna	Ratcliffe
DeLauro	Kildee	Reed
DelBene	Kilmer	Reschenthaler
Delgado	Kim	Rice (NY)
Demings	Kind	Rice (SC)
DeSaulnier	King (IA)	Riggleman
DesJarlais	King (NY)	Rodgers (WA)
Deutch	Kinziger	Roe, David P.
Diaz-Balart	Kirkpatrick	Rogers (AL)
Doggett	Krishnamoorthi	Rogers (KY)
Doyle, Michael	Kuster (NH)	Rooney (FL)
F.	Kustoff (TN)	Rose (NY)
Duffy	LaHood	Rose, John W.
Duncan	LaMalfa	Rouda
Dunn	Lamb	Rouzer
Emmer	Lamborn	Roy
Engel	Langevin	Roybal-Allard
Escobar	Larsen (WA)	Ruiz
Eshoo	Larson (CT)	Ruppersberger
Españillat	Latta	Rutherford
Estes	Lawrence	Sánchez
Evans	Lawson (FL)	Sarbanes
Ferguson	Lee (NV)	Scalise
Finkenauer	Lesko	Scanlon
Fitzpatrick	Levin (CA)	Schakowsky
Fleischmann	Levin (MI)	Schiff
Fletcher	Lewis	Schneider
Flores	Lieu, Ted	Schrader
Fortenberry	Lipinski	Schrier
Foster	Loeb sack	Schweikert
Fox (NC)	Lofgren	Scott (VA)
Frankel	Long	Scott, Austin
Fudge	Loudermillk	Scott, David
Fulcher	Lowenthal	Sensenbrenner
Gabbard	Lowe	Serrano
Gaetz	Lucas	Sewell (AL)
Gallagher	Luetkemeyer	Shalala
Gallego	Lujan	Sherman
Garamendi	Luria	Sherrill
Garcia (TX)	Lynch	Shimkus
Gibbs	Malinowski	Simpson
Golden	Maloney,	Sires
Gomez	Carolyn B.	Slotkin
Gonzalez (OH)	Maloney, Sean	Smith (MO)
Gooden	Marchant	Smith (NE)
Gosar	Marshall	Smith (NJ)
Gottheimer	Mast	Smith (WA)
Granger	Matsui	Smucker
Graves (GA)	McAdams	Soto
Graves (LA)	McBath	Spanberger
Green (TN)	McCarthy	Spano
Green, Al (TX)	McCauley	Speier
Griffith	McClintock	Stanton
Grothman	McEachin	Staubert

Stefanik	Trahan	Watkins
Steil	Trone	Weber (TX)
Steube	Turner	Webster (FL)
Stevens	Underwood	Welch
Stivers	Upton	Wenstrup
Suozzi	Van Drew	Westerman
Swalwell (CA)	Vargas	Wexton
Takano	Veasey	Wild
Taylor	Vela	Williams
Thompson (CA)	Velázquez	Wilson (SC)
Thompson (MS)	Visclosky	Wittman
Thompson (PA)	Wagner	Womack
Thornberry	Walberg	Woodall
Timmons	Walden	Wright
Tipton	Walker	Yarmuth
Titus	Walorski	Yoho
Tonko	Waltz	Young
Torres (CA)	Wasserman	Zeldin
Torres Small	Schultz	
(NM)	Waters	

NAYS—17

Blumenauer	Lee (CA)	Pingree
Carson (IN)	Massie	Pocan
Dingell	McCollum	Rush
Garcia (IL)	Moore	Tlaib
Grijalva	Ocasio-Cortez	Watson Coleman
Jayapal	Omar	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—5

Amash	Davis, Danny K.	Johnson (GA)
Bass	Huffman	

NOT VOTING—12

Abraham	Gonzalez (TX)	Roby
Armstrong	Graves (MO)	Ryan
Gianforte	Moulton	Stewart
Gohmert	Richmond	Wilson (FL)

□ 1904

Messrs. GARCÍA of Illinois and CARSON of Indiana changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mses. GARCIA of Texas, BONAMICI, Messrs. ROUDA, YOUNG, HOLLINGSWORTH, PAYNE, and COX of California changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VENEZUELA TPS ACT OF 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 549) to designate Venezuela under section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to permit nationals of Venezuela to be eligible for temporary protected status under such section, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 268, nays 154, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 498]

YEAS—268

Adams	Allred	Axne
Aguilar	Amash	Bacon

Barragán Gonzalez (TX)
 Bass Gottheimer
 Beatty Graves (GA)
 Bera Green, Al (TX)
 Beyer Grijalva
 Bishop (GA) Haaland
 Blumenauer Harder (CA)
 Blunt Rochester Hartzler
 Bonamici Hastings
 Bost Hayes
 Boyle, Brendan Heck
 F. Herrera Beutler
 Brindisi Higgins (LA)
 Brown (MD) Higgins (NY)
 Brownley (CA) Hill (CA)
 Bustos Himes
 Butterfield Horn, Kendra S.
 Carbajal Horsford
 Cárdenas Houlihan
 Carson (IN) Hoyer
 Cartwright Huffman
 Case Hurd (TX)
 Casten (IL) Jackson Lee
 Clark (FL) Jayapal
 Castro (TX) Jeffries
 Chu, Judy Johnson (GA)
 Cicilline Johnson (TX)
 Cisneros Kaptur
 Clark (MA) Sarbanes
 Clarke (NY) Keating
 Clay Kelly (IL)
 Cleaver Kennedy
 Clyburn Khanna
 Cohen Kildee
 Cole Kilmer
 Connolly Kim
 Cooper Kind
 Correa King (NY)
 Costa Kinzinger
 Courtney Kirkpatrick
 Cox (CA) Krishnamoorthi
 Craig Kuster (NH)
 Crenshaw Lamb
 Crist Langevin
 Crow Larsen (WA)
 Cuellar Larson (CT)
 Cummings Lawrence
 Cunningham Lawson (FL)
 Curtis Lee (CA)
 Davids (KS) Lee (NV)
 Davis (CA) Levin (CA)
 Davis, Danny K. Levin (MI)
 Davis, Rodney Lewis
 Dean Lieu, Ted
 DeFazio Lipinski
 DeGette Loeb sack
 DeLauro Lofgren
 DelBene Swalwell (CA)
 Delgado Lowey
 Demings Luján
 DeSaulnier Luria
 Deutch Lynch
 Diaz-Balart Malinowski
 Dingell Maloney,
 Doggett Carolyn B.
 Doyle, Michael Maloney, Sean
 F. Mast
 Duffy Matsui
 Engel McAdams
 Escobar McBath
 Eshoo McCaul
 Espallat McCollum
 Evans McEachin
 Finkenauer McGovern
 Fitzpatrick McNerney
 Fletcher Meeks
 Fortenberry Meng
 Foster Moore
 Frankel Morelle
 Fudge Mucarsel-Powell
 Gabbard Murphy
 Gallagher Nadler
 Gallego Napolitano
 Garamendi Neal
 Garcia (IL) Neguse
 Garcia (TX) Norcross
 Golden O'Halleran
 Gomez Ocasio-Cortez
 Gonzalez (OH) Omar

NAYS—154

Aderholt Banks
 Allen Barr
 Amodei Bergman
 Armstrong Bucshon
 Arrington Budd
 Babin Bishop (UT)
 Baird Brady
 Balderson Brooks (AL)

Calvert Hunter
 Carter (GA) Johnson (LA)
 Carter (TX) Johnson (OH)
 Chabot Johnson (SD)
 Cheney Jordan
 Cline Joyce (OH)
 Cloud Joyce (PA)
 Collins (GA) Keller
 Collins (NY) Kelly (MS)
 Comer Kelly (PA)
 Conaway King (IA)
 Cook Kustoff (TN)
 Crawford LaHood
 Davidson (OH) LaMalfa
 DesJarlais Lamborn
 Duncan Latta
 Dunn Lesko
 Emmer Long
 Estes Loudermilk
 Ferguson Lucas
 Fleischmann Luetkemeyer
 Flores Marchant
 Foxx (NC) Marshall
 Fulcher Massie
 Gaetz McCarthy
 Gibbs McClintock
 Gooden McHenry
 Gosar McKinley
 Granger Meadows
 Graves (LA) Meuser
 Green (TN) Miller
 Griffith Mitchell
 Grothman Moolenaar
 Guest Mooney (WV)
 Guthrie Mullin
 Hagedorn Newhouse
 Harris Norman
 Hern, Kevin Nunes
 Hice (GA) Olson
 Hill (AR) Palazzo
 Holding Palmer
 Hollingsworth Perry
 Hudson Posey
 Huizenga Ratcliffe

NOT VOTING—10

Abraham Moulton
 Gianforte Richmond
 Gohmert Roby
 Graves (MO) Ryan

□ 1918

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.” So (two-thirds not being in the affirmative) the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVISTS DEBT RELIEF EXTENSION ACT OF 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3304) to exempt for an additional 4-year period, from the application of the means-test presumption of abuse under chapter 7, qualifying members of reserve components of the Armed Forces and members of the National Guard who, after September 11, 2001, are called to active duty or to perform a homeland defense activity for not less than 90 days, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 417, nays 1, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 499]
 YEAS—417
 Adams DeFazio Jordan
 Aderholt DeGette Joyce (OH)
 Aguilar DeLauro Joyce (PA)
 Allen DelBene Kaptur
 Allred Delgado Katko
 Amodei Demings Keating
 Armstrong DeSaulnier Keller
 Arrington DesJarlais Kelly (IL)
 Axne Deutch Kelly (MS)
 Babin Diaz-Balart Kelly (PA)
 Bacon Dingell Kennedy
 Baird Doggett Kildee
 Balderson Doyle, Michael Kilmer
 Banks F. Kim
 Barr Duffy Kind
 Barragán Duncan King (IA)
 Bass Dunn Kinzinger
 Beatty Emmer Kirkpatrick
 Bera Engel Krishnamoorthi
 Bergman Escobar Kuster (NH)
 Beyer Eshoo Kustoff (TN)
 Biggs Espallat LaHood
 Bilirakis Estes LaMalfa
 Bishop (GA) Evans Lamb
 Bishop (UT) Ferguson Lamborn
 Blumenauer Finkenauer Langevin
 Blunt Rochester Fitzpatrick Larsen (WA)
 Bonamici Fleischmann Larson (CT)
 Bost Fletcher Latta
 Boyle, Brendan Flores Lawrence
 F. Fortenberry Lawson (FL)
 Brady Foster Lee (CA)
 Brindisi Foxx (NC) Lee (NV)
 Brooks (AL) Frankel Lesko
 Brooks (IN) Fudge Levin (CA)
 Brown (MD) Fulcher Levin (MI)
 Brownley (CA) Gabbard Lewis
 Buchanan Gaetz Lieu, Ted
 Buck Gallagher Lipinski
 Bucshon Gallego Loeb sack
 Budd Garamendi Lofgren
 Burchett Garcia (IL) Long
 Burgess Garcia (TX) Loudermilk
 Bustos Gibbs Lowenthal
 Butterfield Golden Lowey
 Byrne Gomez Lucas
 Calvert Gonzalez (OH) Luetkemeyer
 Carbajal Gonzalez (TX) Luján
 Cárdenas Gooden Luria
 Carter (GA) Gosar Lynch
 Carter (TX) Gottheimer Malinowski
 Cartwright Granger Maloney,
 Case Graves (GA) Carolyn B.
 Casten (IL) Graves (LA) Maloney, Sean
 Castor (FL) Green (TN) Marchant
 Castro (TX) Green, Al (TX) Marshall
 Chabot Griffith Massie
 Cheney Grijalva Mast
 Chu, Judy Grothman Matsui
 Cicilline Guest McAdams
 Cisneros Guthrie McBath
 Clark (MA) Haaland McCarthy
 Clarke (NY) Hagedorn McCaul
 Clay Harder (CA) McClintock
 Cleaver Harris McCollum
 Cline Hartzler McEachin
 Cloud Hastings McGovern
 Clyburn Hayes McHenry
 Cohen Heck McKinley
 Cole Hern, Kevin Meadows
 Collins (GA) Herrera Beutler Meeks
 Collins (NY) Hice (GA) Meng
 Comer Higgins (LA) Meuser
 Conaway Higgins (NY) Miller
 Connolly Hill (AR) Mitchell
 Cook Hill (CA) Moolenaar
 Cooper Himes Mooney (WV)
 Correa Holding Moore
 Costa Hollingsworth Morelle
 Courtney Horn, Kendra S. Mucarsel-Powell
 Cox (CA) Horsford Mullin
 Craig Houlihan Murphy
 Crawford Hoyer Nadler
 Crenshaw Hudson Napolitano
 Crist Huffman Neal
 Crow Huizenga Neguse
 Cuellar Hunter Newhouse
 Cummings Hurd (TX) Norcross
 Cunningham Jackson Lee Norman
 Curtis Jayapal Nunes
 Davids (KS) Jeffries O'Halleran
 Davidson (OH) Johnson (GA) Ocasio-Cortez
 Davis (CA) Johnson (LA) Olson
 Davis, Danny K. Johnson (OH) Omar
 Davis, Rodney Johnson (SD) Palazzo
 Dean Johnson (TX) Pallone

Palmer	Schiff	Tlaib
Panetta	Schneider	Tonko
Pappas	Schrader	Torres (CA)
Pascarell	Schrier	Torres Small
Payne	Schweikert	(NM)
Pence	Scott (VA)	Trahan
Perlmutter	Scott, Austin	Trone
Perry	Scott, David	Turner
Peters	Sensenbrenner	Underwood
Peterson	Serrano	Upton
Phillips	Sewell (AL)	Van Drew
Pingree	Shalala	Vargas
Pocan	Sherman	Veasey
Porter	Sherrill	Vela
Posey	Shimkus	Velázquez
Pressley	Simpson	Visclosky
Price (NC)	Sires	Wagner
Quigley	Slotkin	Walberg
Raskin	Smith (MO)	Walden
Ratcliffe	Smith (NE)	Walker
Reed	Smith (NJ)	Walorski
Reschenthaler	Smith (WA)	Waltz
Rice (NY)	Smucker	Wasserman
Rice (SC)	Soto	Schultz
Riggleman	Spanberger	Waters
Rodgers (WA)	Spano	Watkins
Roe, David P.	Speier	Watson Coleman
Rogers (AL)	Stanton	Weber (TX)
Rogers (KY)	Staubert	Webster (FL)
Rooney (FL)	Stefanik	Welch
Rose (NY)	Steil	Wenstrup
Rose, John W.	Steube	Westerman
Rouda	Stevens	Wexton
Rouzer	Stivers	Wild
Roy	Suozzi	Williams
Roybal-Allard	Swalwell (CA)	Wilson (SC)
Ruiz	Takano	Wittman
Ruppersberger	Taylor	Womack
Rush	Thompson (CA)	Woodall
Rutherford	Thompson (MS)	Wright
Sánchez	Thompson (PA)	Yarmuth
Sarbanes	Thornberry	Yoho
Scalise	Timmons	Young
Scanlon	Titus	Zeldin
Schakowsky		

NAYS—1

Amash

NOT VOTING—14

Abraham	Khanna	Roby
Carson (IN)	King (NY)	Ryan
Gianforte	McNerney	Stewart
Gohmert	Moulton	Wilson (FL)
Graves (MO)	Richmond	

 1929

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. KING of New York. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 499.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 397, REHABILITATION FOR MULTIEMPLOYER PENSIONS ACT OF 2019; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3239, HUMANITARIAN STANDARDS FOR INDIVIDUALS IN CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION CUSTODY ACT; PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM JULY 29, 2019, THROUGH SEPTEMBER 6, 2019; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mrs. TORRES of California, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 116-178) on the resolution (H. Res. 509) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 397) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to create a Pension Rehabilitation Trust Fund, to establish a Pension Rehabilitation Administration within the Department of the Treasury to make loans to multiemployer defined benefit plans, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3239) to require U.S. Customs and Border Protection to perform an initial health screening on detainees, and for other purposes; providing for proceedings during the period from July 29, 2019, through September 6, 2019; and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REQUEST TO CONSIDER H.R. 962, BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVORS PROTECTION ACT

Ms. CHENEY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 962, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, as recorded in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the request unless it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

Ms. CHENEY. Madam Speaker, I urge the Speaker and majority leader to immediately schedule this bill to protect babies born alive and to stop blocking this most basic responsibility we have.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman is not recognized for debate.

EXPRESSING CONDOLENCES TO THE FAMILIES OF BOEING 737 MAX ACCIDENT VICTIMS

(Mr. PAYNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to extend my sincere condolences to the families who lost loved ones in the Boeing 737 MAX tragedies. One life lost in any accident is one too many, and Congress has a duty to take

steps to ensure that future tragedies do not occur.

Last week Mr. Paul Njoroge and Mr. Michael Stumo, who lost loved ones in this tragedy testified before the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure on how they believe aviation safety can be improved. I commend them for having the courage to testify before the committee under such difficult circumstances.

I personally met with Mr. Stumo and his wife, Nadia, who lost their daughter, Samya, in the Ethiopian Airlines tragedy. I cannot begin to imagine the grief that they are experiencing. As a father of three, it terrifies me to think of harm coming to my children, and I would do anything to prevent it.

Madam Speaker, I am committed to a thorough investigation of the 737 MAX airplane to ensure it is safe before airlines resume commercial flights.

THE LEGACY OF APOLLO

(Mr. BAIRD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BAIRD. Madam Speaker, today I rise to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the human spirit. On July 16, 1969, three Americans boarded a rocket at Kennedy Space Center on Merritt Island, Florida. When they lifted off a few hours later with a flight path toward the unthinkable, humanity was changed forever. Millions of men, women, and children were inspired watching the extraordinary events unfold over the next 4 days as humanity took these first steps on the Moon.

Fellow Purdue University alumnus Neil Armstrong's words: "That is one small step for man, one giant leap for mankind" will forever define that moment in history. The successful journey to the Moon brought with it a tremendous sense of triumph and pride. Our Nation found a bold, common goal that we reached through American ingenuity and determination.

This is the spirit that carries us forward in exploration and innovation today. Right now we are looking at returning to the Moon within the next 5 years and eventually landing on Mars. Madam Speaker, what has been previously unheard of is now being thrust into the scope of reality.

It is our responsibility to keep taking giant leaps to challenge what is perceived as impossible, and I look forward to the next chapter of American space exploration.

RETIREES HAVE EARNED THEIR PENSIONS

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, this week marks a heroic milestone for millions of America's retirees as the House

finally considers the Butch Lewis Act. This bill moves America one step closer to restoring its broken pension promises to 1,300,000 pensioners across our Nation.

Today I met with another 50 retirees from trucking firms, candy manufacturers, miners, and others in Ohio whose futures are at risk in their golden years. Their top concern is economic security.

I heard the stresses they have endured since receiving letters threatening pension cuts of up to 70 percent of their earned pensions. Worry between family members, increased suicides amongst pensioner friends, anxiety and growing health concerns. This isn't the retirement hardworking Americans earned.

Valorie Shapler, a retired Roadway Express truck driver, is suffering from brain cancer. She is fighting for her life daily, and why should she have to worry about the pension cuts that she earned?

Vicki Bailey, a widow of a trucker, raised their family but already struggles to survive on her spousal benefits that were cut in half with her husband's passing, and she has her own health issues to worry about.

Jim Baumgartner asked for a prayer. How can Congress ignore the pleas of millions of hardworking Americans?

Pensions have afforded millions of retired middle-class people some economic security in their retirement years. Please let our colleagues join us in broad bipartisan passage of the Butch Lewis Act tomorrow.

HONORING DR. DAKEYAN CHA DRE GRAHAM AS FLORIDA'S 2020 TEACHER OF THE YEAR

(Mr. SPANO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SPANO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Dakeyan Graham for being selected as Florida's Teacher of the Year. He was chosen out of more than 176,000 teachers to receive Florida's highest award for public educators.

Known affectionately by his students as Dr. Dre, he has long been driven by music. He played the saxophone in the marching band at King High School; and he went on to study music education, earning a bachelor's degree from the University of Florida and a doctorate from the University of South Florida.

He returned to King High School as an educator where he teaches his students music in the same room where he learned to play.

He has worked at the school for more than a decade and now serves as the director of bands and instrumental studies. As part of this award, Dr. Graham will spend 1 year as an education ambassador where he will work to raise public awareness of other exceptional teachers, provide learning opportunities to educators, and recruit future teachers.

Dr. Graham has dedicated his career to serving his students, and this award shows he sets an example not only to his students but to us all.

COMMEMORATING PASTOR R. L. ROGERS

(Mr. VEASEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. VEASEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the life of Pastor R. L. Rogers, a good friend, a man of God, a community leader, father, and husband. Pastor Rogers transitioned from labor to eternal reward this past weekend.

Pastor Rogers attended high school in south Texas before graduating from the Southwestern Theological Seminary in Fort Worth. Pastor Roger's time in seminary started his journey in faith and helping our community that expanded over five decades.

Pastor Rogers was the founder and the only pastor for 53 years of the Harvey Avenue Baptist Church, a place of worship that is a cornerstone in the Fort Worth community. That was only the beginning of his accomplishments.

Pastor Rogers was also an avid volunteer for important causes like mentoring the youth in our community and serving as a chaplain at the Tarrant County Jail. He was also a nationally known evangelist, a pastor, and Gospel preacher.

Pastor Rogers was a pillar in the community spending his 53 years teaching and encouraging the word of God. It was an honor to know Pastor Rogers and just to know the legacy that he has left behind in our community.

My heartfelt condolences to his family. We thank you for sharing Pastor Rogers with us in the Fort Worth community for so long.

RECOGNIZING ED LOMASNEY OF THE BURTCHVILLE FIRE DEPARTMENT

(Mr. MITCHELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ed Lomasney for his 60 years of dedicated service to the Burtchville, Michigan, fire department.

Mr. Lomasney became a firefighter following in the footsteps of his father, who helped found the Burtchville Fire Department. Over the last 60 years, Ed has served as a volunteer firefighter and has been instrumental in growing the firehouse through his time, resources, and mentorship.

In addition to volunteering with the fire department, Ed worked and retired from DTE Energy. He is a devoted husband to his wife, Mary Nell, and loving father to their three children.

For six decades, Ed has been a mainstay of the department, and he will be

missed by all. Although Ed may be retiring from the fire department, we all know he will remain involved in the community to make an impact on all of Burtchville.

Madam Speaker, I join the Burtchville community in thanking him for his dedication and his 60 years of service and wish him the best in his retirement.

MISS NEW JERSEY 2019

(Mr. VAN DREW asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Speaker, a few weeks ago, 28 young, impressive women shared their talents in the Miss New Jersey competition. The competition has been around for almost 100 years and since that time has evolved into a fantastic celebration of some of the best young individuals in south Jersey.

The Miss New Jersey competition was the first to offer a talent category, and this past year the competition focused even more on aptitude and intellect over outward appearance. This year the candidates were able to emphasize their individual styles and their individual passions, and all of the young women spoke about different social impact initiatives that mattered greatly to them.

One of my wonderful spring interns, Alyssa Rodriguez, placed in the top 11 with her platform of social media awareness. She made south Jersey so very proud. Miss Jade Glab of Belmar, New Jersey, was crowned Miss New Jersey with her platform of healthy children, strong America.

We are proud of all the contestants and the intellect and the compassion they bring to all of their communities, and I am most proud of our contestants from south Jersey.

□ 1945

WAYCROSS AREA COMMUNITY THEATER

(Mr. CARTER of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Waycross Area Community Theater for all of its work to support local theater while preserving historical structures in the First Congressional District of Georgia. Using local talent to provide live family friendly musicals, this community theater is truly a gem.

Since 1913, theater has played a large role in the social scene of Waycross, with the Ritz Theater hosting operas there. Noted as one of Georgia's "finest theater" structures, the Ritz Theater transitioned over time into showing only movies and then, finally, going dormant.

Now, the Waycross Area Community Theater maintains the historic art

deco-style theater with its live productions, and their work has not gone unnoticed. Aside from the crowded audiences, the Fox Theater has awarded grants to the Community Theater over the last 2 years to help preserve the historic Ritz Theater.

Thank you to all who perform shows, attend musicals, and preserve the wonderful theater culture in Waycross, Georgia.

FEDERAL TRIO PROGRAMS

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3800, the Educational Opportunities and Success Act, the bill introduced last week by my colleague Representative WARREN DAVIDSON of Ohio.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 3800 seeks to address a common, yet preventable, issue impacting students from low-income families and first-generation college students. In recent years, applicants to the Department of Education's Upward Bound program found themselves stuck in financial limbo when their grant applications were rejected due to clerical errors, some errors as insignificant as using the wrong font.

This is unacceptable. I was proud to cosponsor H.R. 3800, a bill that reauthorizes the TRIO programs for 5 additional years.

I am also proud to work with my colleagues across the aisle to support this commonsense legislation that eases the administrative burdens during the application process.

TRIO programs like Upward Bound are critical in ensuring disadvantaged students have a shot at turning the dream of a college education into a reality, and H.R. 3800 has my full support.

CONSENSUS RULE SUBVERTED

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, it has now been 6 legislative days since H.R. 553, the Military Surviving Spouses Equity Act, was denied a standalone vote.

Democrat leadership subverted their own rules and prevented a vote on this bipartisan legislation, which now has 371 cosponsors, over 86 percent of the Members of the Congress.

Under new rules in this Congress, H.R. 553 qualified for the Consensus Calendar, a provision for bills to receive a standalone vote. An article published in *The Hill* stated today: "The new rule keeps top House leaders from squelching any bill that has at least 290 cosponsors, or two-thirds of the House membership."

Sadly, the Democrats did just that. They targeted and removed H.R. 553 from the Consensus Calendar.

Democrat leadership should bring this bill to the floor. The time is now to give these rightly deserved benefits to the surviving spouses of service-members and finally end the widow's tax.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

CONGRATULATIONS TO GARY JOHN ALEKNAVICH ON HIS RETIREMENT

(Mr. SOTO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, tonight, I would like to honor Gary John Aleknavich and congratulate him on his upcoming retirement.

Gary John Aleknavich is a U.S. Navy veteran, labor leader, maintenance foreman, journeyman mechanic, and certified welder by trade. He has received a certificate of achievement for completing courses at the Florida International University Center for Labor Research and Studies.

After serving in the U.S. Navy from 1976 to 1979, Gary was hired by Florida Power and Light, and then went on to become an apprenticeship mechanic at the Florida Port Everglades Power Plant. In 1984, he became a journeyman mechanic at the St. Lucie Nuclear Power Plant, and later became a mechanical certified welder and a nuclear maintenance foreman.

He has held various positions within his local union of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, including treasurer, executive board member, job steward, System Council U-4 delegate, and national convention committee delegate, and served as the Florida Electrical Worker Association's vice president and executive board member.

Gary has been a member of IBEW since 1980 and even started the process to establish and train IBEW officers and members in the IBEW Code of Excellence training program. He soon became System Council U-4, assistant business manager of IBEW System Council U-4, and was later elected to serve as business manager in 2005, where he ran unopposed for four additional 3-year terms and will retire next month.

There is no question that Gary John Aleknavich has been a leader in his community and a public servant, and one of labor's strongest members.

Madam Speaker, for that, we thank him.

34TH ANNUAL PARK AND RECREATION MONTH

(Mr. WESTERMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate our Nation's parks.

This July marks the 34th annual Park and Recreation Month, a celebration highlighting the incredible opportunities and benefits that park and recreation agencies provide to their communities.

I, like many Arkansans, grew up enjoying everything that the Natural State has to offer. From hiking and hunting in its forests, to swimming, fishing, and boating on its crystal-clear lakes and rivers, outdoor recreation is an essential part of life for the families of my State. Some of my favorite memories of life were made outside in the beautiful outdoors of Arkansas, and I am blessed to still be making similar memories today.

Our park and recreation agencies are an important part of our history and offer much to the quality of our future. Theodore Roosevelt once said: "It is an incalculable added pleasure to anyone's sum of happiness if he or she grows to know, even slightly and imperfectly, how to read and enjoy the wonder-book of nature."

As a forester and lifelong lover of nature, the wonder-book of nature has always been fascinating to me, and I hope to motivate people to get out and enjoy the natural beauty around them.

In the words of the fictional sitcom character Leslie Knope, "America is awesome." I encourage everyone to go outside with friends and family to enjoy all the awesomeness our parks have to offer.

CONGRATULATIONS TO ALLEN INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT ON BEING NAMED THE DISTRICT OF DISTINCTION

(Mr. TAYLOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TAYLOR. Madam Speaker, today I rise to congratulate Allen Independent School District for being named a District of Distinction by District Administration Magazine.

Allen ISD serves thousands of students grades K through 12 in a rapidly growing community. In an effort to meet growing needs of the community, Allen ISD launched a STEAM Center to provide a unique learning environment to help foster an interest in STEAM amongst students. The brand-new facility offers students hands-on learning experiences ranging from indoor robotics labs to outdoor discovery gardens.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me today in congratulating Allen ISD, their staff, parents, and students for being named District of Distinction and commend them on their dedication to cultivating a passion in students for learning more about science, technology, engineering, art, and mathematics.

DELEGITIMIZING THE STATE OF ISRAEL AND OPPOSING THE BDS MOVEMENT

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, tonight we voted on a resolution opposing efforts to delegitimize the State of Israel and oppose the Global Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions, BDS, Movement targeting Israel.

I am a cosponsor of this resolution, but the House should also be voting on legislation to combat these efforts to undermine one of our strongest allies, like the Senate did when they passed a bill to authorize State or local governments to divest assets from entities deploying BDS against Israel.

But, unfortunately, Democrat leadership refuses to let us vote on this bill in the House for fear of fractures within their own party. Just last week, one of their Members actually introduced legislation that supports this hate-fueled BDS movement, even drawing disgraceful comparisons between boycotting Israel now and boycotting Nazi Germany in the 1930s and 1940s.

Let's not forget that the United States and Israel have a long history of working together to achieve stability in the Middle East, the inventions they work on together, and they remain one of our strongest and most loyal allies today.

Our actions in this Chamber need to unequivocally support that relationship and the lone beacon of freely elected government that is Israel in the Middle East.

As Golda Meir put it:

We will only have peace when they love their children more than they hate us.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. WEXTON). The Chair would inform the House that, pursuant to H. Res. 497, the Speaker has certified to the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia the refusal of William P. Barr and Wilbur L. Ross, Jr., to produce documents to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

MAKE IT IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Speaker, given all of the talk that is going on and the investigations and questions about deficits and the like, I thought it would be useful today to start this discussion, which I will spend most of the evening talking about American manufacturing, but I often want to start these discussions with some sense of

value: What is our goal? What are we trying to accomplish here?

I keep going back to FDR. At the height of the Great Depression, he said: "The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much; it is whether we provide enough for those who have too little."

And so, last week, the House of Representatives—the Democrats, that is, and maybe just a few Republicans—voted to increase the minimum wage across this Nation so that, over the next 5 years, the minimum wage would rise from, I guess, just over \$7 an hour to \$15 dollars an hour—not a jump immediately, but over time increase it.

Why do we do that? Well, we are for the people.

That is our goal: for the people; and keeping in mind what FDR said: It is not about whether we add more to those who have much, but, rather, what we do for those who have little.

And so we raise the minimum wage. Why? Because those people who are making \$7 an hour across this Nation, they have very, very little, in fact, so little that they cannot have both food and shelter.

And, of course, we talk about healthcare and our goal to expand healthcare to every American so they have insurance, so that the worrying about how they would be paying for their hospital visit or their doctor is set aside and they are able to get the care that they need to lead a healthy and productive life.

That is our goal. We are for the people, and we are going to address this in so many, many ways.

□ 2000

One of the ways that we want to address it is to make sure that America remains a strong manufacturing country.

Many, many years ago in California, I was looking at how to keep the California economy going, and we hit upon the five keys for a successful economy:

First of all, a great education system so that your workers are well educated and can handle the questions of the day and the tasks of tomorrow;

Secondly, that there be strong research, and, from that research, you build tomorrow's things. Sometimes that is an app. Sometimes it is a computer. Sometimes it is a ship or perhaps a car, an autonomous vehicle, a drone, whatever, so that your research then moves on into things that you make, and, that is, the manufacturing. That is the creation of wealth.

Some time ago, I was visiting one of the wineries in my district in California, and I was talking about this Make It In America Agenda in manufacturing. And, finally, the owner got up from behind the desk, and he said: Come. I want to talk to you.

We walked outside and out to his winery, and he said: You know what this is?

I said: Yeah. It is a winery.

He said: No. This is a manufacturing facility. I take grapes, and I turn them into some of the finest wine in the world. So, when you talk about Make It In America, guess what. I am making it in America.

So, it includes all of these things, putting a tomato into a can, into a bottle of ketchup. But what we are going to talk about tonight is something far more than that.

I want to really not so much talk about these gentlemen and ladies, but to use them as an example of what America used to make. These gentlemen, three of them, are World War II merchant mariners.

This is an effort we have now under way to provide these mariners, who had the highest death rate of any unit in the armed services during World War II, a Congressional Gold Medal. We now have nearly 300 Members of this House who are signed on to that so that they will get a Congressional Gold Medal.

But this is not about their gold medal; it is about what they were able to do.

America, during the World War II period, was the manufacturing center of the world. And we made ships—literally, thousands and thousands of ships—that these gentlemen and so many like them sailed the oceans, provided the material, the personnel to fight that war.

When we met and took this picture, they asked me: Why is it that America doesn't build ships anymore?

I said: Oh, but we build naval ships; we build aircraft carriers; we build destroyers; we build many other kinds of naval ships.

They said: No. No. That is not what we are talking about. We are talking about the ships that sail the high seas. Why doesn't America make those ships?

And I said: We can. We can if we write the laws in the proper way to encourage the shipbuilding industry and, just as important, the cargo to go on those ships.

Now, it happens that America is in the midst of a great energy revolution—the green energy, no doubt about it. We are talking about every kind of green energy, from wind to solar, biofuel and biomass, and on and on. And we are doing that.

But, simultaneously, America, over the last decade, has become a major developer and supplier of petroleum products: oil, as a result of fracking in the Bakken area and Texas, California, onshore, offshore. We are a major oil producer.

And, simultaneously, we are also a major producer of natural gas. All of these energy supplies, whether they are the green energy or the petroleum energy, are a strategic national asset.

And, as these gentlemen told me: Our ships, during World War II, were a strategic national asset. We had oil tankers, we had cargo vessels, all of them built in America and with American mariners.

We, the mariners, we were a strategic asset. And a lot of us died. Our ships were a strategic asset, and the oil that we sent around the world was also a strategic asset.

So, where are we today? Are we making ships? Nope. We are not. But we could.

So, this last week, Senator ROGER WICKER—my colleague in the Senate, a Republican from the Gulf Coast—and I introduced, for the second Congress, the Energizing the American Shipbuilding Act, taking a strategic national asset, our petroleum and natural gas, and welding it together with the shipbuilding industry, which gives us the strategic ships that we need to move our military around the world and to provide the energy that they need.

So, the Energizing the American Shipbuilding Act is now introduced in the Senate, for the second session, last year and again this time around with the new session of Congress.

What we will do is to address this problem: We could buy ships that are made in China, Japan, and Korea, or we can make them in America. If we make the ships in America, we will provide thousands of jobs, not only in the shipyards and the steel industry and the aluminum industry, but also the maritime suppliers, the men, the factories here in the United States that build the pumps, build the engines—the electrical engines, the big diesel engines—that are in these ships or the LNG engines that are in these ships, and all of the electronics.

That entire array of equipment that goes into a ship could be built in America if the Energizing the American Shipbuilding Act were to become law.

So, how does it work? Pretty simple. It simply requires that our strategic national asset, the petroleum and the natural gas, be exported on American-built ships with American mariners—not all of it, just a small percentage of it, 15 percent of the oil and 10 percent of the natural gas, which will be liquified natural gas on American-built ships.

What does that mean? That means that American shipyards that are now producing zero commercial oil tankers and zero LNG carriers would, over the next 13 to 15 years, build upwards of 40 ships: 25 to 30 LNG tankers and 10 to 15 oil tankers.

Thousands of jobs would be created in American shipyards, and that strategic national asset, the shipyards themselves, would be able to continue to operate here in the United States. They would continue to be able to have the skilled workforce and, simultaneously, be better prepared to compete for the U.S. naval ships, giving the American taxpayer a strategic advantage, more competition in the shipyards, more competition when it comes time to build our naval vessels.

There is another aspect of this that I want to bring to your attention. Beyond the shipbuilding and the Ener-

gizing the American Shipbuilding Act, there is the rest of manufacturing here in the United States.

About 8 years ago, when I first came to Congress, we were looking at this issue based upon my time in California, and we decided, together with STENY HOYER, who is now our majority leader, that we should establish the Make It In America program. We have been working on this for 8 years now, and we are looking at different pieces of legislation over time to encourage the manufacturing here in the United States.

One of the ways we can do this—and we are not going to go into the President's tariffs right now, but we are going to go at it in a little different way. Here is just an example of about what happened almost a decade ago.

In California, it was time to build the new San Francisco Bay Bridge. The bid went out. The State of California went out to bid on this thing for the steel in the bridge.

At that time, a Chinese company decided that they wanted to enter the market. Very specialized steel in this bridge in the San Francisco area, so they wanted to enter the market, and they produced a bid that was 10 percent lower than an American steel company.

China got the bid. What did they get? Not only did they get the job; they got a new steel mill, one of the most advanced in the world, and they also had some over 3,000 jobs in China.

At the very same time, New York was building the Tappan Zee Bridge. They said, no, we are only going to buy American steel, and so they did, total cost, \$3.9 billion.

In California, total cost, \$3.9 billion over the estimated cost. Why? Because the Chinese steel had problems, the welds and other problems with the steel.

Not in New York. They came in on the bid, and there were 7,700 American jobs in the steel industry and in the manufacturing and engineering—just.

An example, not current today, but certainly current nearly a decade ago.

But this is what happens when our laws or our governments decide that we are going to make it in America, we are going to produce the steel, we are going to build the bridges here in the United States.

So, building on this idea, we have now introduced in both the Senate and the House another Make It In America piece of legislation. This legislation is authored in the Senate by Senator TAMMY BALDWIN and here in the House by me.

It basically says that all of this talk about infrastructure, which is critically important, that that infrastructure, if it is an American taxpayer dollar that is being used to build that infrastructure—whether that is a power line or a highway or a sanitation system or a water system or an airport—if there is a Federal dollar involved, that we make it in America.

It simply applies to all types of infrastructure. When American taxpayer

dollars are being used, that that infrastructure—the steel, the pipe, the electronics, the other elements that are in that infrastructure—that they be made in America.

So it is part of our Make It In America agenda that we have been working on all these years, and we are going to apply it wherever we see an opportunity. If it is in the steel industry for bridges and infrastructure, you bet. You bet, we are going to make sure that it is made in America.

Many of these laws already exist. A couple of years ago, we were able to raise the percentage of American content by a couple of percentage points to about, if I recall, about 65 percent on certain infrastructure projects. But we want to extend that beyond.

And why not go the whole way? Let's make it all in America. If it is a taxpayer dollar, 100 percent American made. That is our goal. So our Make It In America agenda goes forward from here.

I am going to end with putting this one back up again because this has an opportunity to be a very, very important part. The steel in the ships, the pumps, the pipes, the electronics, the propellers, the drive shaft, the engines—all of those things—can be made in America if we have a national policy that simply says the export of a strategic national asset, oil and gas, that that be on American-built ships. Not all of it, 10 percent, 15 percent, 40 ships over the next 15 years or so when the Energizing the American Shipbuilding Act becomes law.

□ 2015

We are looking for support. We have broad support right now, both Republican and Democratic, with Senator WICKER from Mississippi and Senator CASEY from Pennsylvania. On this side, about 30 of my colleagues, Democratic and Republican, have signed up in support of this legislation.

It has great potential. It has great potential, but not so much for these mariners. They are all in their nineties right now. Hopefully, we will be able to get them a Congressional Gold Medal.

For tomorrow's mariners, for those men and women who will be on ships that will supply the necessary material, oil, gas, or whatever for our military around the world, and will participate in the annual commerce of goods and services that are being transported in and out of America, that next generation of mariners will have the ships, jobs, and cargo.

For the People, once again, we are constantly looking for different laws, different ways in which we can advance the well-being of the American public. If it is healthcare, we are looking to lower costs. If it is education, we want to make sure that the cost of college education is affordable. If it has to do with jobs, we are looking for ways to make that happen by requiring that your tax dollars be spent on American-made equipment, by requiring that a

small percentage of the export of a precious national resource be on American-built ships with American sailors.

I want all of us to keep in mind that there are things that public policy can do to improve the well-being of every American. Our For the People policy includes all of these elements, and we draw your attention to that.

I am looking to my colleagues for continued support on these two pieces of legislation that we will be working on in this session.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

SUPPORT INCREASED DOMESTIC ENERGY PRODUCTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, we are here tonight, as the House Energy Action Team, to discuss the numerous economic, national security, and environmental benefits of the American energy renaissance.

The HEAT team will never be supportive of policies that increase electricity prices for consumers, favor foreign-based production over domestic, and deter the development and construction of energy infrastructure.

Due to policies that incentivize private investment and production, the United States has become the global leader in natural gas and oil producing, as well as refining. This has given us the ability to export energy to our friends, allies, and countries that want to import U.S. energy.

Energy Secretary Rick Perry recently said, "The United States is not just exporting energy. We are exporting freedom." I couldn't agree more.

There is no national security without energy security. We understand that in the House Energy Action Team.

Looking at this graph, in 2018, U.S. crude oil production exceeded 11 million barrels per day, surpassing Russia as the world's largest crude oil producer. The U.S. produced 12.16 million barrels per day of crude in April 2019.

I was just out in North Dakota, in the Bakken. I am amazed at the production going on in that little corner of the world. I say "little," but the Bakken is huge. It is a tremendous resource for the Nation.

In fact, we are producing more oil and natural gas in the Bakken in North Dakota and Montana than they are in the country of Venezuela, which is known for its natural resources, known for its oil production. They are producing more in the Bakken.

Robust domestic energy production is essential to global leadership in the United States. According to the U.S. Energy Information Institute, natural gas and oil supplied about two-thirds of American energy used in 2016.

Oil and gas will continue to be a prominent source of energy. The En-

ergy Information Institute estimates that fossil fuels will account for nearly 70 percent of the country's energy used by 2050.

The goal should be to produce, develop, or make fossil fuels available cleaner through private sector innovation, not regulation. That should be the goal, private sector innovation, not the heavy boot of government telling the innovators what they should or should not do. The innovators are actually making things cleaner. We are producing a lot, and we are exporting a lot.

One thing I applaud President Trump for doing is challenging Chancellor Merkel and Germany to lessen their dependence on a foreign source of energy, in this case, not the Arab states, Saudi Arabia, or others, but lessen their dependence on Russia. A lot of Europe, Eastern Europe and Western Europe, get their energy from Russia, Gazprom and Rosneft, which support Vladimir Putin.

By lessening Europe's dependence on Russia for their energy, Russia is no longer an influencer. It can't turn the spigot on and off to influence political policy in Europe.

Europe still has to meet its energy needs. It can do that looking west to the United States through our export of LNG, liquefied natural gas put on ships, sent to Europe, and off-loaded to provide the natural gas and energy security for our friends and allies overseas to lessen their dependence on Russia.

Exports of U.S. LNG are set to rise 72 percent this year, as compared to 2018. Russia is just a gas station masquerading as a country, but they are providing that natural gas to Europe. They use their levers of influence, turning that spigot on and off to affect policy not only in Eastern Europe but in Western Europe. Those policies and those pipelines continue to be built to provide that natural gas.

We need to provide that from this country. We have an abundance. We have an abundance of oil, too. We are now an exporter of oil.

If we look at what the U.S. energy sector has been able to do during this American energy renaissance, it will show that we are a leader in energy production and energy technology. We can help other countries around the globe to meet their energy needs with our technology as well.

Madam Speaker, we have a great group of House Energy Action Team members who want to talk about what is going on, maybe in their States, maybe things they know about in this Nation. I know RICK ALLEN wants to talk about nuclear power and what is going on in Georgia. I know BRUCE WESTERMAN wants to talk about what is going on in Arkansas. We have so many others.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN) to talk about what is going on in his part of the world.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman, my friend from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN), for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I want us to take a moment to reflect tonight, reflect where our country has been and where our country is going. I think about my grandparents who grew up in a home that didn't even have electricity, didn't have running water. Even my parents were young when they got electricity in their home.

Madam Speaker, it was just 150 years ago when the main source of energy in this country was wood fuel. We have come a long way in this country. We have seen a better way of life. We have seen nicer things because of the technology and innovation that we have had in this country.

Our energy policy should be the same energy policy that got us to where we are today because we have a bright future ahead. That energy policy is simply to provide the cleanest energy possible for the lowest cost possible.

We shouldn't discriminate against energy sources. Energy is energy. It is carbon atoms. It is hydrogen. It is the energy that we have that we convert to things like electrical energy. Just because one energy is viewed as dirtier than another energy doesn't mean that, someday, that energy can't be clean energy.

If we look at recent developments, it wasn't long ago that natural gas was an expensive form of energy. It wasn't in abundant supply. Through technology, we have been able to release vast amounts of natural gas across our country.

As a matter of fact, we are seeing a lot of coal plants converted to natural gas, not because of regulatory requirements but because of the economic benefits of burning natural gas, clean natural gas. We know the control technologies to get very high combustion rates and also the ability to capture the NO_x, or nitrous oxides, that are released from burning natural gas.

It wasn't that long ago that we didn't think we had enough natural gas. Because of great technology, we can experience an environment here in the United States where our carbon emissions are actually dropping.

We shouldn't punish one energy source over another energy source. We should strive to use technology to make energy as low-cost and as clean as possible.

We can do this, whether it is renewables, solar, wind, biomass. All of those are valid sources of energy that we can, hopefully, learn how to capture, to distribute in a manner that people can enjoy all across the country in a way that gives consumers reliable supplies at a low cost.

With this, we will see our economy continue to grow. We will see our quality of life improve. It is really not something that should be partisan or that we should argue about, simply to provide energy at a low cost.

Let's look at transportation fuel. Some are in favor of doing away with all fossil fuels in transportation. What would that do to our environment?

If we look at global emissions across the world, the United States is responsible for 15 percent of carbon emissions throughout the world. If we look at that a little bit closer and break it down on transportation fuels, transportation fuels account for 27 percent of carbon emissions in the United States. Twenty-seven percent of 15 percent is only about 4 percent.

If we did away with all gasoline, all diesel fuels, got rid of all combustion engines, if we did away with jet fuel, with ships, if we took fossil fuels out of every form of transportation in the United States, it would wreak havoc on our economy. It would wreak havoc on our way of life. But it would reduce global carbon emissions only by around 4 percent.

There is a better, smarter way to do that. Let's take the abundant energy that we have. Let's apply our wonderful research facilities, the great minds and innovators that we have in America. We can figure out how to use all of our energy sources in a low-cost, clean way. We can all continue to experience a brighter future ahead.

I thank my colleague for hosting this time tonight where we can, hopefully, get some of the facts and common sense about energy out on the table.

Just remember, as low-cost and as clean as possible, that is a winning formula for American energy.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN). He was out in North Dakota with me. One thing we saw with natural gas and oil being produced out there, and the understanding of a need for infrastructure in this country, gas utilities the United States added over 730,000 miles of pipeline to serve almost 220 million more customers.

At the same time, methane emissions have fallen 70 percent, 75 percent, and CO₂ emissions from U.S. power systems are at their lowest level since 1985. Pipelines are the safest way to transport natural gas, but some parts of the country refuse to accept this reality.

For example, New England has moratoriums on natural gas extraction, and the inability to construct a pipeline caused an increase in electricity prices. These policies are just asinine and need to change.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. KEVIN HERN), a freshman Member of Congress and a leader on the House Energy Action Team. We will hear about what is going on in his great State of Oklahoma.

□ 2030

Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague for yielding me a few minutes here to talk about the energy dominance in our country, and tonight we are celebrating American excellence

and innovation in a field absolutely essential to the future of our country: energy.

There is a lot to be debated and argued on, but the crux of the matter is that energy independence—better yet, energy dominance—is the only pathway to a stable, fruitful, successful American economy.

We use energy every day. We power our homes, our offices, our cars, our phones, and our devices. All of this uses energy in a different way. Since energy is such a pervasive need in our society, it should be a top priority in Congress.

Completely cutting our energy sources like clean coal, which we have relied on for centuries, is simply not the answer. Making drastic, astronomical changes to our economy and way of life are simply not feasible, let alone rational.

My district is home to the oil and gas sector. One in five jobs in Oklahoma are supported by the oil and natural gas industry. Every new direct oil and gas job supports more than two additional jobs statewide. The average Oklahoma oil and natural gas worker makes more than \$94,000 per year.

Not only is Oklahoma's energy sector a major job creator and economic stimulator, but it is also a nationwide leader in oil production and innovation in the industry.

In 2017, Oklahoma was the Nation's sixth largest crude oil producing State. As of last year, we had five operable petroleum refineries with a combined daily processing capacity of over half a million barrels per day, accounting for almost 3 percent of the U.S. total. More than a dozen of the country's 100 largest gas fields are located in Oklahoma.

These are things to be celebrated, not criticized. If you were to listen to some of our colleagues across the aisle, you would think oil and gas are the enemy. That is not the case at all. Oil and gas are the foundation to build on.

Renewable energy like wind and solar are great, and I agree that we need to continue investing in them and researching how to improve them, but they are not a replacement for oil and gas. The future of energy in our country is dependent on an all-of-the-above approach. All of these energy sources can and should work together to make America successful and energy dominant on the world stage.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on HEAT this year to find out energy solutions that play to our country's strengths as well as incorporate the innovation that new technologies provide.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, I tell you, in Oklahoma, they know energy. I think one of the first wells ever drilled in the United States of America was over in Oklahoma. And another place they know a lot about energy is down on the Gulf Coast in my adopted State of Louisiana.

The gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES) knows energy, and they have

got a lot going on in The Pelican State. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina for hosting this event tonight.

Madam Speaker, this is really important because it impacts every single American. Energy is one of those pervasive issues that, if you drive a car, if you ride in a taxi, if you take public transit, if you have a house or you have an apartment, you have to pay the energy bills. It affects every single one of us.

Madam Speaker, we have options before us. We can choose to go down this path of ignoring the energy abundance that the United States has; we can pivot in this direction of blindly seeking these lofty goals or ambitions without any technological basis, without any basis in infrastructure or reality; or we can move in a direction where we can produce American energy, and we can produce it safely and we can produce it affordably.

Madam Speaker, let's go down the paths of what these options look like.

If you look back in 2011, Madam Speaker, one half of this Nation's trade deficit, one half of it was attributable to us importing energy from other countries—one half. That means that we are sending hundreds of billions of dollars, hundreds of thousands of jobs, we are sending them, we are empowering them in countries like Iran, in countries like Venezuela and other Middle Eastern and African nations in many cases, Madam Speaker, that don't share our values. They are taking those dollars and coming back and directly challenging American interests around the globe.

This doesn't make sense. You don't arm those who wish harm upon you. But that is what our energy policy was back in 2011. Again, one half of this Nation's trade deficit attributable to us importing energy.

Now, more recently, Madam Speaker, you have seen folks who have come in and said: Hey, we want to migrate to no fossil fuels whatsoever.

Think about it. If you were running a business and if your greatest asset was this abundance of American natural gas, of oil, of coal, think about if that is what your asset was and if you had this objective of achieving environmental sensitivities or this objective of reducing our emissions and providing more clean energy solutions, would you just go and say: Look, we are just going to ignore all these resources?

No. You would develop technologies on carbon capture and storage, on utilization to where you could take that resource and you could actually market it and make products from it or you could sequester it. That way you can continue to have a robust economy; you can continue to have affordable energy; you can continue to have American jobs without harming our economy.

Now, Madam Speaker, when you look at the option that some have chosen where they have chosen we are going on an aggressive renewable strategy, let's look at the State of California where you have double or triple the cost of electricity as you have in my home State of Louisiana—double or triple.

On top of that, Madam Speaker, look at what the State of California has done. They have increased—increased—imports of oil from countries like Saudi Arabia and others, increased their dependence upon foreign energy, exporting jobs, exporting untold dollars to these other economies. It is fascinating.

Let's go over to the Northeast, where, recently, you have seen them object to transmission sitings, object to natural gas pipelines. Madam Speaker, what they have done there, in doing so, they had to burn heating oil to warm the homes in the winter, one of the least efficient means of emissions. They had to import gas from Russia—from Russia—putting who knows how many dollars in Vladimir Putin's hands to challenge U.S. interests around the globe.

Madam Speaker, these strategies are flawed. By rejecting some of these policies of the past, by pursuing the U.S. energy dominance agenda, we have been able to reduce emissions in the United States more than the next 12 countries combined, while continuing to have a robust economy, some of the lowest unemployment rates we have seen in decades, and ensuring that the United States can export energy like we are doing with liquified natural gas right now to 35 countries, rather than being dependent upon those other nations.

We have two choices, Madam Speaker. I urge American energy dominance.

I want to thank, again, the gentleman from South Carolina for yielding.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Natural gas is being produced in this country in a tremendous amount, so much so, that we can export it anywhere in the world. But those on the other side are refusing to accept the reality of the benefits of natural gas. In fact, Berkeley, California, is the first American city to ban natural gas from being used in new homes and businesses, being banned from being used in new homes and businesses to heat and cook in their homes, probably banning transportation fuels, as well.

Natural gas is affordable for so many Americans, and I can tell you what. When Americans go to the pump, they are conscientious about the price because the money they put in that tank could be the difference in discretionary income they could use for other things.

When you help keep energy prices down, not only transportation fuels, but energy prices through the electricity generation in this country—folks over in Georgia understand elec-

trical generation. In fact, they are building the Nation's only nuclear power plant over in Augusta, Georgia.

I yield to the gentleman from Savannah, Georgia, to talk a little bit about that.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank the gentleman for hosting this here tonight.

This is extremely important, and the House Energy Action Team and the Members who have spoken here and the Members who will continue to speak play an important role in making sure that we get this message out, because, Madam Speaker, I am here to join my colleagues in discussing America's energy resurgence and to bring to light the many developments and advances that have been made in our Nation, and there are many. Lots of developments, lots of advances have been made in our Nation.

We are in the midst of an economic boom. We all know that. We know that our economy is booming. We know that we have seen record low unemployment rates and that we have seen growing incomes. Simply put, jobs are being created and people are going back to work. As we look to the Nation's energy needs and output, people will often forget about how energy costs impact both people and the economy.

I have always said that I subscribe to the all-of-the-above type of energy strategy, and I do; and I think it is extremely important for a number of different reasons, not the least of which is to make sure that we in America have energy independence, to make sure that we have affordable energy, that we never put ourselves in the position that I can remember us being in in the late seventies, where we were dependent and were literally held over the barrel, if you will, by other nations for our energy needs.

We as a nation benefit from lower energy costs, meaning our monthly home energy bills are lower and the costs to do business are lower. Lower costs translate into the ability of companies to invest in their businesses and in their employees.

American energy independence has been crucial to the growth we have seen since the recession. There is also significant investment by companies across the United States to be good stewards of their communities.

Yes, it can be done. Yes, we can have energy independence. Yes, we can be good stewards of our communities.

We are seeing significant investments in new, cleaner technologies, taking old and inefficient plants offline, looking to energy efficiency and actively managing emissions. As has been mentioned by other speakers, we have done a great job in America of decreasing our emissions and still keeping our economy growing. There is a lot to be said for that.

Carbon management has really caught on for a number of employers, and the technology that can make it

more effective is very promising. For instance, there are companies actively looking to pull carbon from the air, to sequester it into the ground through direct air capture. This technology continues to develop and to mature.

There are also important carbon capture systems being developed in my home district. We are seeing incredibly efficient turbines being built that produce much lower emission numbers than similar products or plants.

In addition, I have the honor of serving on the Energy and Commerce Committee, and we have done quite a bit of work addressing the regulatory issues that would prevent these innovative and new technologies from coming to market. We are doing everything that we can to get the government out of the way.

I have always said that the greatest innovators, the greatest scientists are right here in the United States of America, and they are. That is why I look toward the future with great anticipation, because I think this is going to be a great opportunity for us as Americans.

I look at renewable energy. I look at everything that is going to be done in the way of energy production, and I see America leading the way, and it is important the Federal Government not be an obstacle, not be a barrier to that.

As more regulatory hurdles are put up, the costs increase. That is why we focus on innovation and technology, new ideas and making sure that the private sector has the ability to explore these opportunities.

As I mentioned earlier, there are countless examples of employers seeking new options to reduce their impact on their communities and looking to ways to be good stewards. In manufacturing alone, companies are looking at how to turn those challenges of reducing consumption into new opportunities.

While one side of industry is looking at that, the energy sector is also investing in researching ways to become more efficient and effective when it comes to reducing emissions and expanding their energy mix.

Madam Speaker, if you want to see a country that can innovate, if you want to see a country that can lead, you look to the United States of America. Again, that is why I am so excited about the future of our energy production.

Just up the river from my district, Plant Vogtle has the only two nuclear units under construction in the United States. For a nation that once developed and dominated the nuclear sector, we have lagged behind direct competitors.

As the largest carbon-free source of power in the world, it makes sense to move forward with developing next-generation technology that can lower costs. Nuclear energy is an area we can and should continue to once again have a leading role in the world.

Whether it is nuclear, more efficient equipment, carbon capture, or some

other form of energy, now is our chance to really drill down and focus on the innovation and technology development that is needed.

I join my colleagues here on the HEAT team as we continue to work towards policy solutions to these issues facing our country.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia, and he was one of the first members of the House Energy Action Team. He comes from the Energy and Commerce Committee, working with me alongside some others on the HEAT team.

I want to applaud Whip SCALISE for allowing the House Energy Action Team to be reformulated, give us a chance to talk, communicate directly with the American people about American energy renaissance, American energy issues.

□ 2045

I would like to recognize the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON). Before I do, I will say that one of the biggest honors I have had in my life came this year when Governor Abbott made me an honorary Texan. So I am proud to stand alongside my fellow Texan, PETE OLSON from Texas, to talk about what is going on in the great State there.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON).

Mr. OLSON. Madam Speaker, I thank my dear friend from South Carolina for those kind words about being an honorary Texan. We Texans take no offense to the comments he gave to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES) about that being his home away from home, with all the ties between South Carolina and Texas.

The Battle of the Alamo commander, William Barret Travis, who died for our freedom, came from South Carolina. Two football players who would take our Houston Texans to the Super Bowl, Jadeveon Clowney and Deshaun Watson, are products of South Carolina.

I am happy to join my friend and the HEAT team tonight to talk about the American energy renaissance.

Texans like to call this the era of America crushing OPEC's monopoly and finally tearing down Mr. Putin's wall of energy control over former Soviet Union states, nations like Estonia.

My wife and I went there about 2 years ago on a Baltic cruise. We saw happy, happy people, like people in that picture.

As my friend knows, that is a merchant vessel called Independence. It has been loaded with liquefied natural gas from Sabine Pass, Louisiana, by a company known as Cheniere, our first LNG port plant in American history.

Two years ago, that ship pulled up in the capital of Estonia. As you can see, thousands and thousands of people waved flags and said welcome to Estonia, American liquefied natural gas, because they know that is not just a product. That is their freedom from Mr. Putin's autonomy and brutality.

They know we exported liquid American freedom to Estonia.

In contrast, our port in Houston is 52 miles long. If I got five people to walk out and see a tanker pull up, that would be huge. Our battleship, the USS *Texas*, is over 100 years old. She is about to be moved to be repaired, to be moored permanently, at Galveston Island. If I got 10 people, maybe 20, to watch our battleship be moved, that would be awesome.

Those people came out in droves because they know their control by Mr. Putin is over.

Let's talk about a great new ally called India. Their Prime Minister, Mr. Modi, is coming to Houston September 22. I have met the man four times. They are a growing economy of 1.4 billion people. They have our values.

They have a problem with their energy. They have none that they can use in a clean, efficient manner. They have a lot of coal, but coal is dirty. They have no natural gas. They have no fossils, no oil.

They can't have a pipeline deliver those products to their nation. Coming from the west, that pipeline has to go through Iran and Pakistan, enemies. To the north are the Himalaya mountains. If you could get a pipeline over an 18,000-foot elevation, God bless you. That is the eighth wonder of the world. To the east is a place in the world that is falling apart, Bangladesh.

Their only solution to have cleaner air and energy independence is American LNG coming via the sea, a ship. One showed up last year loaded with LNG, again from Sabine Pass.

We signed a contract, private sector to private sector, in India to deliver 14.4 megatons of LNG to India for over 20 years. That means there is no way we, the government, can get involved here in America or India. It is private sector to private sector freedom.

Finally, Madam Speaker, to my friend, I have to brag about Texas. Liberal friends want to address climate change with carbon capture. We are okay with that, but it must be viable in our economy, and it must be viable in a free market.

A company back home called NRG has a power plant 10 miles from my house called the Parish Power Plant. Parish generates energy from eight sources, four natural gas and four coal generators.

Wanting to improve their business and make the air cleaner, make more money, and help out the world, on their own, they reached out to a Japanese company to build a carbon capture system that grabs over 92 percent of CO₂ up one of the coal stacks. But that technology was very, very expensive, over \$1 billion.

Our friends want energy to swallow that product and bury that money in the ground, that captured carbon in the ground. That means you will bury \$1 billion in the ground.

How can clean energy do that? By passing those rates on to the ratepayer. Unacceptable.

What did they do? They grabbed that CO₂, and they have a pipeline that goes 85 miles southeast to an old, depleted oil field. It is like fracking fluid. That CO₂ puts more pressure, so oil comes out, and we sell it in the market. It is viable.

In short, LNG dominance by America makes my home State of Texas great; it makes America greater; and it makes the whole world the greatest it can be.

Drill, baby, drill. Frack, baby, frack. Export, baby, export.

Madam Speaker, I thank my friend for the time.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON) for being here tonight.

We hear a lot about the Green New Deal. That proposal is based solely on solar, wind, and hydropower in an effort to drastically cut carbon emissions across the country. In my State of South Carolina, we have seven reactors that produce 95 percent of the State's emission-free electricity, 53 percent of our total electricity costs.

I want to show a graph really quickly before I introduce the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

This graphic shows the magnitude of one nuclear reactor and compares the capacity factors of one reactor, rated at 1,154 megawatts, to wind turbines. To match one reactor, it takes 2,077 windmills. Yes, there are 2,077 windmills on this graph, and 2,077 would be needed.

Think about the amount of acreage that it would take just to put the windmills up to meet the electricity generated from one nuclear reactor.

I mentioned earlier the State of Georgia is building the only nuclear reactor being built in this country right now, and that is down at Vogtle in Augusta, Georgia.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN), from Augusta, and I am sure he is going to talk about nuclear energy.

Mr. ALLEN. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN) for chairing this Special Order tonight.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to be a member of this House Energy Action Team. It is a special coalition of Members of Congress who are focused on energy policy. I was honored to be selected as the nuclear subteam leader. This will allow me to do my part to advance our nuclear energy priorities through Congress and allow America to remain a dominant player in the global nuclear industry.

The theme for this Special Order is the American energy renaissance.

I have to tell you, after President Trump took office, the war on energy and the war on business was over. It was like flipping on a light switch. America was open for business again, and the American people responded. We have the best economy in the world.

Since then, we have continued to invest in our own energy resources and

have successfully made the United States energy independent. Who would have thought that 10 years ago?

Georgia's 12th Congressional District is on the front line of the American energy renaissance, with the first two new nuclear reactors being built in the United States in the past 30 years at Plant Vogtle.

Just in March, I had the opportunity to be with Secretary of Energy Rick Perry to see the placement of the top of the Unit 3 containment vessel, truly a historic moment.

There is Secretary Perry, and there is the setting of the top of that vessel.

Finishing construction on these two units means that Americans can still do big things. I look forward to Units 3 and 4 coming online soon.

Nuclear energy plays an important role in Georgia's energy portfolio, as it accounts for more than a quarter of all power generated and is the only clean air source that can produce large amounts of electricity around the clock.

Georgia 12 is also home to all of Georgia's nuclear capabilities, with four nuclear reactors, two already online at Plant Vogtle and two at Plant Hatch. These facilities currently employ almost 2,000 people, year-round, high-skilled employees.

The construction of Units 3 and 4 at Plant Vogtle is the largest construction project in Georgia, with more than 8,000 workers onsite.

When we talk about clean energy in this country, we don't need out-of-touch, costly socialist policies like the Green New Deal that would devastate the best economy in the world. We are talking about unleashing private-sector innovation, like nuclear power.

According to the Nuclear Energy Institute, Georgia's nuclear energy facilities alone avoid more than 21 million metric tons of carbon dioxide emissions each year, the equivalent of more than 4.4 million passenger cars.

It is of the utmost importance that we ensure these nuclear plants continue to provide energy in a safe, reliable, and affordable manner.

Georgia has been selected 6 years in a row as the best State to locate your business. A big reason for that is our low energy costs.

Overall, I believe we must continue to pursue a proactive, responsible, and all-of-the-above energy policy that will benefit hardworking Americans and lower the cost of energy in this Nation.

The House Energy Action Team will continue to be laser-focused on continuing America's energy renaissance, and I am so glad to be a part of it.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's comments, and I thank him for leading the group down to look at that nuclear reactor.

Madam Speaker, it was cold this winter up in Michigan. Had it not been for fossil fuels, a lot of folks would have had a hard time.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG)

to talk about his role on the Energy and Commerce Committee and here on the House Energy Action Team.

Mr. WALBERG. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN) for yielding.

Often during that polar vortex, I thought of South Carolina and sometimes wished that I could enjoy the warm breezes.

Madam Speaker, as a member of the House Energy Action Team as well as a proud member of the Energy and Commerce Committee serving on the Energy Subcommittee, I rise today about an important subject we have been talking about here, and that is American energy security and independence.

Madam Speaker, like many of my colleagues, I understand the importance of being a good steward of our environment. As an avid outdoorsman, a proud representative of the energy district of the Great Lakes State, a district that has wind, solar, nuclear, hydro, and coal power, along with natural gas, we have it all there. But I want my children and my grandchildren to experience the same beautiful world that I have experienced. In fact, Madam Speaker, I want them to experience even better.

We can do that in the use of our energy as well, but we are not going to get there through socialist policies like the Green New Deal that will cause energy prices to skyrocket and commit, really, a fraud on the American people.

□ 2100

Instead, we should focus on solutions that spur innovation and encourage investments in new technologies that support these goals while keeping a reliable, resilient grid. These investments are happening now, but the transition needs to happen in an orderly way that doesn't hinder economic growth or the security of our country.

One step we can take right now is to update our energy policies for the 21st century. The energy landscape looks totally different than it did 40 years ago. Energy resources are abundant instead of scarce. It is a more diverse market than ever before, and it will continue.

With that in mind, I introduced H.R. 1502, the PURPA Modernization Act. The bill simply increases competition and reforms outdated regulations from the 1970s, so that consumers are not burdened with unnecessary costs on their utility bills coming from stale, outdated green energy regulations.

We also can't forget that an all-of-the-above energy approach will continue to utilize safe, clean, and resilient nuclear-based power, like that produced at the Fermi plants in my district.

Getting new technologies, like advanced carbon capture, out of a lab and into the market is also crucial. This past winter, we saw the importance of baseload power when temperatures in Michigan and other places in the north plummeted to lower than 40 degrees below zero.

I would point my colleagues to bipartisan legislation that I helped introduce last week with my friend and colleague from Texas, Representative CRENSHAW, which would provide a jump-start to those innovative technologies at commercial scale.

In closing, Madam Speaker, let's get to work on legislating, not political messaging. The American people sent us here to work on solutions that impact their pocketbooks and, yes, also promote their pursuit of happiness. That is what America is about: unleashing American energy. And bringing down prices for families we represent is certainly an important crucial discussion to have.

Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman tonight for leading this.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, America watching tonight will see that we have got a lot of great leaders in Congress that understand energy, and they come from a lot of different States.

The State of Arkansas produces oil, produces coal, produces a lot of biomass, and produces hydroelectric. They also produce a lot of ducks. I enjoy going to Arkansas and hunting.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL) to talk about what is going on in his great State.

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend from South Carolina for yielding. He is welcome in the beautiful rice country of Arkansas to hunt ducks this fall at any time. I appreciate his leadership of the Sportsmen's Caucus, the largest bipartisan caucus we have here in the House, and all of the good work it does in wildlife conservation and conservation of our public lands, so I thank my friend for that.

It is true, I appreciate also his work in the House Energy Action Team and that of our whip, STEVE SCALISE of Louisiana. And that is because we all are talking tonight about the importance of energy to our economy, the importance of energy to our families, and how that has to be balanced in the world of public policy.

Madam Speaker, in 2018, crude oil was the world's number one export product. Last year, the U.S. accounted for 98 percent of global growth in oil production. Since the Congress lifted the 40-year ban on oil exports in 2015, U.S. production continues to set records, and, just last month set a new all-time high of exporting 3.3 million barrels of crude per day.

Lifting the ban has filled pipelines and sparked a surge of investment across this land in new shipping infrastructure around the U.S.

Total crude imports have also dropped significantly as we rely now more on domestic production and that production produced by our friends in Canada. Likewise, exporting clean natural gas is a leading export of the United States.

South Korea is now the largest buyer of American clean natural gas, Madam

Speaker. That is cleaning up their skies, lowering their carbon emissions, and cutting their trade imbalance with the United States.

Exporting more gas, exporting more oil, and lifting the ban has allowed us to be an energy leader in the world. We are no longer second fiddle to the Gulf, to Saudi Arabia, or to Russia. This comes as the United States is leading the world also, Madam Speaker, in reducing global climate or carbon emissions. Between 2000 and 2014, the United States reduced emissions more than 18 percent.

On the contrary, the world's largest carbon emitters, like China and India, continue to have no policy to reduce their emissions, despite having the lowest marginal cost to do that. In the EU and the United States, it is very expensive for us to lower carbon emissions per unit. But, when you are a major carbon polluter, such as India and China, the marginal cost to clean up their action is so much cheaper.

Instead, China is building 300 new coal plants, and not a single country in the EU is on target to meet their carbon reduction goals. These countries must do more to be competitive with us on the efforts we are taking here in the U.S.

Like my friends from Georgia and South Carolina, I am a strong supporter of nuclear energy because it is the cleanest, most green form of base power generation. In Arkansas, we get about 19 percent of our electricity generated from nuclear.

And I support the idea of better and more effective ways to store nuclear waste, which we have talked about and tried to pass in this House. Any discussion of eliminating carbon emissions must include nuclear energy.

We also must invest in longer battery life technologies and lowering barriers towards solar cell innovation. The future of clean energy rests with harnessing the power of the Sun and being able to store that power cheaply and portably. No one, Madam Speaker, is doing more research on that than the United States. We are spending over \$550 million a year on advanced energy research to make our country even more energy competitive.

So, I believe, like many of my colleagues, we need to pursue an all-of-the-above energy strategy that will lead us to a cleaner, less carbon-dependent world without forcing American families and Arkansas families to bear the burden of flawed policies like the Green New Deal or the Paris climate accord.

Madam Speaker, I thank my friend from South Carolina for this time, for his leadership, and I look forward to working with him on these issues in the years to come.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, I thank all of the members of the House Energy Action Team for coming to the floor tonight and communicating with the American people about the American energy renaissance.

When our constituents think about cost of energy, a lot of times their first thoughts are transportation fuel. How much is it going to cost them to fill up the tank? Is there going to be enough money left over after their transportation fuel costs to feed the family, buy groceries, maybe do improvements, and other things that American families spend money on.

But one of the factors in energy cost is what you pay for that electricity and what do our manufacturers pay for that electricity? Where does that electricity get generated? And, most importantly, will it be a 24-7, 365-day baseload power supply always on, available when they want to manufacture that next BMW in Greer, South Carolina, or that next Boeing aircraft in Charleston, or the next component that goes in one of those manufactured all over the country.

We take for granted in this Nation that we do have a 24-7, 365-day baseload power supply always on, and it is transmitted over tremendous infrastructure, but that infrastructure needs to be improved. We need pipelines to transfer and transmit the natural gas that is being produced and the oil that is being produced in places like Texas, Louisiana, Arkansas, and Oklahoma. But also the wind power that is generated wherever wind is generated and solar power wherever solar power is generated, there has to be transmission lines to get that power to the grid so that it can be used.

So as we have the conversation in America about all of the above—and one thing the House Energy Action Team is about is all of the above; we like wind, solar, and hydro, it is all groovy—but we know what works, and that is nuclear power and that is hydro and fossil fuels, supplemented by the alternative fuels that are coming online.

We have got the GrayMatter innovators and entrepreneurs in this country to meet some of the things that Mr. HILL talked about: the battery capacity. And that is there to store that power to be used when needed, when it is generated by wind and solar. It is intermittent to store that power, it's generated when the Sun is shining and generated when the wind is blowing, and it is stored to be used at night or when the wind isn't blowing. Nuclear power always runs, and natural gas always runs. These are components of this debate that we need to talk about.

Madam Speaker, I appreciate Members of the House Energy Action Team coming to the floor and talking with America with so much passion about American energy to meet the needs of our constituents, but at an affordable price that helps our constituents meet their budgets.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and in-

clude extraneous material on the topic of this Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity for this Special Order, and I yield back the balance of my time.

DECORUM ON HOUSE FLOOR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL) for 30 minutes.

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Madam Speaker, today I rise to reflect on the recent acts of Speaker PELOSI and other Members of the majority last week on the House floor, it was a clear and egregious violation of the rules of the House that transpired.

House Members are expected to speak respectfully of their fellow Members of Congress and of the President of the United States, a precedent that goes back to the very first Congress about conduct on the floor of the House.

Citing Jefferson's Manual, the first American book on parliamentary procedure, "References to racial or other discrimination on the part of the President are not in order."

Last week, Speaker PELOSI clearly violated Chapter 29, Section 65.6 of Jefferson's Manual. The House parliamentarian ruled her speech violated the rules forbidding personal attacks on the House floor against the President.

Sadly, the majority then voted to ignore the rules in order to justify the Speaker's breaking of our rules.

Madam Speaker, how do we expect the American people to follow the laws we pass in this Chamber when we don't even follow the rules that we place on ourselves?

I call on the majority to put partisanship and pointless attacks aside and get back to the real work that will move our great country forward.

CRISIS IN SYRIA

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to, once again, speak out about the crisis in Syria.

The director general of the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons recently reported that traces of a nerve agent or poison gas byproduct were discovered late last year at Syria's Scientific Studies and Research Center.

Even though we were assured by the Obama administration that the Russians would remove all the chemical weapons in Syria, this report is not surprising. For some, photos of dead bodies in the streets littered with children, victims of barrel bombing, or asphyxiated by sarin gas just weren't enough.

Now we have a United Nations report. The United Nations reports that, since May, fighting in Idlib Province has forced 300,000 Syrians to flee their

homes and thousands more continue to die from Assad's butchering.

Madam Speaker, when will this House finally grow weary of 8 years of Assad's treachery: more than 570,000 dead, 200,000 imprisoned, and nearly 12 million dislocated?

The House must act.

Speaker PELOSI well knows, this House, under Republican leadership, passed the Caesar Syria Civilian Protection Act three times over the past three Congresses, only to have it bogged down in the Senate.

□ 2115

Now, Madam Speaker, the tables are turned. Leader MCCONNELL passed S. 1 in February, and we in the House must finally act with expedition and pass the House version of S. 1, which is H.R. 336, to end this step back into darkness, stop the torture and murder of thousands, and move to convict Assad and his henchmen of war crimes.

ANTI-BDS RESOLUTION

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to talk about H. Res. 246, a resolution stating Congress' opposition to the ongoing efforts to delegitimize the State of Israel in the Global Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions Movement, or BDS, targeting Israel.

H. Res. 246 passed this House today. Let me get one thing clear, though. BDS is anti-Semitic at its core, and it seeks to delegitimize and isolate our ally Israel.

I am a strong supporter and I cosponsored H. Res. 246, but this is not the piece of anti-BDS legislation that we should have considered on the floor of this House this week. We should not be letting the majority off the hook by passing a nonbinding House resolution. H. Res. 246 does not take tangible action to combat the BDS movement, nor does it have any teeth in it.

Instead, we should be considering and passing H.R. 336, the Strengthening America's Security in the Middle East Act, which is the House version of S. 1. This legislation, Madam Speaker, passed the Senate in February by an overwhelming, bipartisan vote of 77–23.

H.R. 336 includes the Combating BDS Act, which allows a State or local government to divest its assets from entities using BDS against Israel. This bill includes other important provisions for U.S. and Israel security assistance.

Why won't Speaker PELOSI bring this overwhelmingly bipartisan bill to the House floor? Well, the reason they are avoiding this bill in favor of a toothless resolution is because the majority party in this House is hopelessly divided on what should be a common-sense issue. Imagine House Democrats hopelessly divided about anti-Semitism—sad.

Resolutions serve an important purpose in this House, but at other times, we need legislative action. This is the time for legislative action. We should be changing the Federal law to no longer allow entities to use BDS to at-

tack the only democracy and our greatest ally in the Middle East.

UNITED STATES-MEXICO-CANADA AGREEMENT

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement, known as USMCA. I congratulate the Trump administration for successfully updating the 1994 North American Free Trade Agreement, or NAFTA, and enhancing the benefits to Arkansans in the form of expanded export sales and growth in jobs.

USMCA modernizes and rebalances the 25-year-old NAFTA, including a 21st century approach to digital trade, intellectual property rights, and cross-border data flows.

In Arkansas, trade with Mexico and Canada alone supports over 100,000 jobs, and this highlights the need to preserve and strengthen our North American trading relationship.

USMCA is a big win across the board. We will have stronger growth, more exports, more jobs, and rising wages. This agreement results in a more level playing field for American workers, farmers, ranchers, and businesses.

Madam Speaker, Canada has approved it. Mexico has passed the enabling legislation for it and has approved this treaty. Now it is time for Speaker PELOSI to bring the USMCA to the floor and seek approval of this House.

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM MINISTERIAL

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to thank Secretary of State Mike Pompeo and Ambassador-at-Large for Religious Freedom Sam Brownback for hosting the 2019 Ministerial to Advance Religious Freedom.

This second ministerial on religious freedom makes the protection of religious freedom around the world a priority for this administration. This global conclave demonstrates that the United States proudly stands for religious liberty and tolerance so that everyone from all nations can worship freely and without discrimination.

I agree with former President Ronald Reagan when he addressed the United Nations General Assembly in 1986 by saying: "Respect for human rights is not social work; it is not merely an act of compassion. It is the first obligation of government and the source of its legitimacy."

It is through this obligation of service to our fellow man that we can make our societies better for our children and all future generations yet to be born.

AMERICAN TAEKWONDO ASSOCIATION

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the American Taekwondo Association and the roughly 20,000 people who gathered in Little Rock for the 2019 Worlds ATA Martial Arts competition just last week.

ATA is celebrating its golden anniversary this year with 50 years of international training. This organization

was founded in 1969 and relocated to Little Rock in 1977, citing similarities between the State's landscape and that of South Korea.

My friend, Mrs. Sun Cha Lee, is the chairman of the board for ATA Martial Arts and is committed to changing lives through martial arts and her philanthropy.

As a fellow member of the Rotary Club of Little Rock, Mrs. Lee embodies the motto of "service above self" and continues to lead their scholarship foundation that has provided over \$1 million to deserving students.

Mrs. Lee and ATA's cultural addition to Little Rock's story has made an indelible impact on Arkansas citizens and communities.

I would like to extend gratitude and congratulations to Mrs. Lee on reaching this memorable milestone. I wish her and all of ATA much continued success for generations to come.

EAGLE BANK ANNIVERSARY

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Eagle Bank and Trust Company on its 100th anniversary. Eagle Bank has been serving customers since 1919 and has grown into 13 full-service bank locations.

Eagle Bank was the vision of Harry Hastings, Jr., who applied for a bank charter for the First State Bank of Sherwood in 1964, eventually becoming Eagle Bank and Trust Company in 1988.

In 2012, the bank merged with Heber Springs State Bank, which received its original bank charter in 1919 and was originally known as Arkansas National Bank of Heber Springs. The bank survived the Great Depression and the 2008 recession, never closing its doors on its customers.

Today, Cathy Hastings Owen, daughter of Harry Hastings, operates Eagle Bank and Trust Company. In 2018, she became the 128th chairman of the Arkansas Bankers Association and is the first woman to lead that important organization.

I would like to extend my congratulations to the Hastings family and Eagle Bank and Trust Company, and I wish the company much continued success for generations to come.

FLOODING—PREVENTION, PREPARATION, AND CLEANUP

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize three Faulkner County, Arkansas, Scouting units that helped fill sandbags in preparation for the historic flooding that occurred in Arkansas just in the past few weeks.

Pack 444, Troop 444, and Troop 644, all of the First United Methodist Church in Vilonia, volunteered to help our communities in need. This group who filled sandbags included children in elementary school and up to high school-aged teens.

Arkansans began filling sandbags on May 22, and more than 65,000 sandbags have been filled by volunteers from across our State. Sandbagging helps divert water from peoples' homes and

was an effective way to prevent and reduce the flood damage from these historic floods.

I thank the Scouting units of First United Methodist Church and all of those who volunteered their time to help those affected by this historic flooding.

CONGRATULATING FORD OVERTON

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Madam Speaker, today I want to rise and congratulate and thank my very good friend, Ford Overton, for his selfless service to the State of Arkansas.

Ford served on the Arkansas Game and Fish Commission for 7 years, including serving as chairman in his final year. His term just expired on July 1.

As a graduate of the University of Arkansas at Fayetteville, his love for the outdoors has always been evident, especially his interest in fishing and preservation of habitat.

While on the commission, Ford worked with wildlife biologists and lawmakers to ensure that future generations of Arkansans will be able to continue to enjoy the healthy wildlife populations with which we are so abundantly blessed. He successfully inspired many young Arkansans to enjoy the great hunting and fishing opportunities all across our State.

Ford's service to the State of Arkansas and to wildlife conservation will not be forgotten, and I join all Arkansans in congratulating Ford on his infectious passion and leadership throughout the State.

RECOGNIZING THE HEROIC ACTS OF TROY BRASWELL, SR.

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the heroic acts of Mr. Troy Braswell, Sr., a World War II veteran, for his remarkable service to our country.

Troy grew up in Louisiana, and after graduating from high school, he joined the Navy to serve his country. He was only 17 years old, and his role was that of a powderman.

During his service, Troy served on the USS *Mississippi*, survived a kamikaze attack, and, afterwards, contracting tuberculosis. He was told by a doctor that he had but 6 months to live.

He overcame and survived these challenges, and after his military service, Troy located to Arkansas in 1945. In 1952, he graduated from the University of Central Arkansas, then called Arkansas State Teachers College. Troy turned 93 years old earlier this year and currently resides in Hot Springs Village.

Troy's sacrifice for Arkansas and for America will not be forgotten, and I join all Arkansans in thanking him for his bravery and his dedication to our State and our country.

RECOGNIZING VICTORY MISSION BIBLE TRAINING CENTER

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Victory Mission Bible Training Center's grand opening and ribbon cutting earlier this month in Center Ridge, Arkansas.

Victory Mission Bible Training Center is an 8- to 10-month residential discipleship training program catering to those who struggle with problems such as alcoholism and addiction. It is strictly donation-based and available to people of all ages who need this important assistance.

I want to congratulate the resident director, Ms. Jennifer Jones, herself a graduate of the program. She was homeless and struggled with alcohol and drug addiction before entering this important program.

Since 1960, over 24,000 people have been treated by Mission Teens centers, and 89 percent of their graduates report that they are doing well. Several have gone into the ministry or now help at one of the 20 centers across the United States.

Alcoholism and addiction are powerful diseases, and I am grateful to the Center Ridge community for the opening of the Victory Mission Bible Training Center and their worthwhile investment in the health of our citizens and their community.

□ 2130

HONORING DR. EDITH IRBY JONES

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Edith Irby Jones, a civil rights leader and the first African American graduate at the University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences. Dr. Jones recently passed away at the age of 91.

Dr. Jones became a distinguished physician on the national stage and accomplished many firsts for African Americans and women. She was the first African American woman to intern in the State of Arkansas, the first to intern at Baylor College of Medicine Affiliated Hospital, and the first female president of the National Medical Association.

As a child, Dr. Jones experienced the deaths of her father and sister and suffered from rheumatic fever that left her temporarily unable to walk or attend school. Despite her hardships, she went on to become the first African American female resident at Baylor and was one of the founders of Mercy Hospital in Houston.

When Dr. Jones wasn't practicing medicine, she was in schools and churches, advocating for racial equality. She later became an advocate for underprivileged patients and earned an award for volunteerism and community service by the American College of Physicians.

She also has been inducted into both the University of Arkansas College of Medicine Hall of Fame and the inaugural group of women inducted into the Arkansas Women's Hall of Fame.

I honor Dr. Jones for her determination, dedication, and contributions to civil rights and enriching the lives of countless Arkansans and Americans. She was a role model and a friend to many across our State. I extend my respect, affection, and prayers to her friends, family, and loved ones.

CONGRATULATING ANNE MARIE DORAMUS

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Anne Marie Doramus on her recent appointment to the Arkansas Game and Fish Commission, becoming the first woman so appointed as a full-term commissioner.

A graduate of the University of Arkansas at Fayetteville, her interest in the outdoors has always been evident, especially duck hunting and bass fishing in southeast Arkansas. She is a founding member of the Arkansas Outdoor Society, a group of young adults passionate about conservation and the outdoors.

Commissioner Doramus, with leadership and passion for conservation, will be a great asset to the commission over the next 7 years. She embodies the talent of the next generation of leaders who will be protecting and promoting our great outdoors.

I join all Arkansas in congratulating Anne Marie and wish her much success throughout her term as a commissioner.

CONGRATULATING CAMP ROCKEFELLER

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Arkansas' Camp Rockefeller for being recognized, once again, as a nationally accredited camp by the Boy Scouts of America National Camp Accreditation Program.

BSA's National Camp Accreditation Program recognizes camps that provide a fun, high-quality, and safe program consistent with the Boy Scouts of America brand and what the public expects from scouting.

Camp Rockefeller successfully completed a review of over 200 standards related to the safety and quality of the program, including campgrounds, properties, and the well-being of every camper, leader, and visitor. Over the years, Camp Rockefeller has shown continuous improvement in all areas.

Camp Rockefeller is located within Gus Blass Scout Reservation. Each year, thousands of scouts from across the country enjoy this beautiful part of Arkansas and are given the opportunity to participate in hiking, fishing, climbing, camping, and other outdoor activities.

As a fellow scout, I am proud of these high standards that are being set at Camp Rockefeller. On behalf of all Arkansans, congratulations, and we look forward to following your continued success in the years to come.

CONGRATULATING CONWAY FOR RECYCLING AWARD

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Conway Department of Sanitation in the city of Conway, Arkansas, on being named the 2019 Recycling Education Program of the Year by the Arkansas Recycling Coalition. This award honors an agency or association that has made a significant contribution to the advancement of waste reduction, recycling, and sustainability across our State in the past year.

Conway was selected for this award as a result of its outstanding public education and community outreach effort. This involved talking with more than 2,700 community members of all ages from schools, daycares, churches, homeowner associations, universities, and more.

Recycling is a component of making the environment a cleaner place, conserving materials, saving energy, and reducing the size of our landfills.

I extend my congratulations to the Conway Department of Sanitation and the entire city of Conway for its worthwhile commitment to our environment and our natural resources.

CONGRATULATING FAIRFIELD BAY ON TOP 100 PLANNED COMMUNITIES HONOR

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Fairfield Bay, Arkansas, on being named the Best of the Best Top 100 Planned Communities in America by ideal-LIVING Magazine. The Best of the Best honors those areas and communities that deserve special recognition for their outstanding qualities, facilities, and programs.

Fairfield Bay began as a planned community 40 years ago and has grown into an ideal family recreation destination. It was chosen from hundreds of nominations from North America and Central America.

A huge congratulations to the community, to the residents of Fairfield Bay, and to Mayor Wellenberger on achieving this recognition. I look forward to following the Fairfield Bay community as it continues to grow in the years to come.

RECOGNIZING JOURNALISM AWARDEES

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize two central Arkansas journalists who received the Golden 50 Service Awards from the Arkansas Press Association for a half-century in journalism.

Larry Miller, from Morrilton, Arkansas, is the editor of the Conway County Petit Jean Country Headlight newspaper.

Frank Fellone of Little Rock was also recognized and is a former Arkansas Democrat-Gazette deputy editor and now an independent journalist.

I also congratulate David Bailey, managing editor of the Arkansas Democrat-Gazette, on receiving the Arkansas Press Association Freedom of Information Award.

I congratulate these men who exemplify the spirit and dedication behind the mission of these awards and our First Amendment, and I wish them continued success in the years to come.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The Speaker announced her signature to enrolled joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles:

S.J. Res. 36.—Joint Resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed transfer to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Kingdom of Spain, and the Italian Republic of certain defense articles and services.

S.J. Res. 37.—Joint Resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed export to the United Arab Emirates, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the Republic of France of certain defense articles and services.

S.J. Res. 38.—Joint Resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed export to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland of certain defense articles and services.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 24, 2019, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF PAYGO LEGISLATION

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YARMUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that H.R. 34, the Energy and Water Research Integration Act of 2019, as amended, would have no significant effect on direct spending or revenues, and therefore, the budgetary effects of such bill are estimated as zero.

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YARMUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, the attached estimate of the costs of H.R. 549, the Venezuela TPS Act of 2019, as amended, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

ESTIMATE OF PAY-AS-YOU-GO EFFECTS FOR H.R. 549

Table with columns for fiscal years 2019-2029 and 2019-2024, 2019-2029. Row for NET INCREASE OR DECREASE (-) IN THE DEFICIT. Values: 0, 265, 298, 135, 140, 133, 123, 120, 103, 101, 101, 971, 1,519.

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YARMUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that H.R. 1837, the United States-Israel Cooperation Enhancement and Regional Security Act, as amended, would have no significant effect on direct spending or revenues, and therefore, the budgetary effects of such bill are estimated as zero.

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YARMUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that H.R. 1850, the Palestinian International Terrorism Support Prevention Act of 2019, would have no significant effect on direct spending or revenues, and therefore, the budgetary effects of such bill are estimated as zero.

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YARMUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that H.R. 2938, the HAVEN Act, would have no significant effect on direct spending or revenues, and therefore, the budgetary effects of such bill are estimated as zero.

MUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that H.R. 3304, the National Guard and Reservists Debt Relief Extension Act of 2019, would have no significant effect on direct spending or revenues, and therefore, the budgetary effects of such bill are estimated as zero.

MUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that H.R. 3311, the Small Business Reorganizing Act of 2019, would have no significant effect on direct spending or revenues, and therefore, the budgetary effects of such bill are estimated as zero.

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YAR-

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YAR-

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YARMUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote

on passage, the attached estimate of the costs of H.R. 3504, the Ryan Kules Specially Adaptive Housing Improve-

ment Act of 2019, as amended, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

ESTIMATE OF PAY-AS-YOU-GO EFFECTS FOR H.R. 3504

	By fiscal year, in millions of dollars—													
	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2019–2024	2019–2029	
NET INCREASE OR DECREASE (–) IN THE DEFICIT														
Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Impact	0	3	29	–47	–56	–38	–36	–36	–32	62	65	–109	–86	

Components may not sum to totals because of rounding.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker’s table and referred as follows:

1732. A letter from the Director, Office of the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission’s final rules — Revisions to Prohibitions and Restrictions on Proprietary Trading and Certain Interests in, and Relationships With, Hedge Funds and Private Equity Funds [Release no.: BHCA-6; File no.: S7-30-18] (RIN: 3235-AM43) received July 17, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1733. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Indian Country: Air Quality Planning and Management; Federal Implementation Plan for the Kalispel Indian Community of the Kalispel Reservation, Washington; Redesignation to a PSD Class I Area [EPA-R10-OAR-2017-0347; FRL-9996-67-Region 10] received July 16, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1734. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s direct final rule — Massachusetts: Final Approval of State Underground Storage Tank Program Revisions, Codification, and Incorporation by Reference [EPA-R01-UST-2018-0085; FRL-9996-56-Region 1] received July 16, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1735. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s direct final rule — Oregon: Final Approval of State Underground Storage Tank Program Revisions, Codification and Incorporation by Reference [EPA-R10-UST-2019-0191; FRL-9996-69-Region 10] received July 16, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1736. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Colorado; Revisions to Regulation Number 4, Sale and Installation of Wood-Burning Appliances and the Use of Certain Wood Burning Appliances During High Pollution Days [EPA-R08-OAR-2019-0054; FRL-9995-93-Region 8] received July 16, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1737. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification that the national emergency with respect to transnational criminal organizations, originally declared in Executive Order

13581 on July 24, 2011, is to continue in effect beyond July 24, 2019, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1622(d); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 202(d); (90 Stat. 1257) (H. Doc. No. 116–50); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

1738. A letter from the Acting Architect, Architect of the Capitol, transmitting the semiannual report of disbursements for the operations of the Architect of the Capitol for the period of January 1, 2019, through June 30, 2019, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 1868a(a); Public Law 113-76, div. I, title I, Sec. 1301(a); (128 Stat. 428) (H. Doc. No. 116–51); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

1739. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration’s final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Prohibit Directed Fishing for American Fisheries Act Program and Crab Rationalization Program Groundfish Sideboard Limits in the BSAI and GOA [Docket No.: 180327320-8999-02] (RIN: 0648-BH88) received July 17, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1740. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration’s temporary final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Golden Tilefish Fishery; 2019 Specifications [Docket No.: 180808738-8738-01] (RIN: 0648-XG417) received July 17, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1741. A letter from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration’s final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Permit Renewal Applications [Docket No.: 171128999-8999-02] (RIN: 0648-BH43) received July 17, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1742. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration’s final rule — International Fisheries; Pacific Tuna Fisheries; Fishing Restrictions for Fish Aggregating Devices in the Eastern Pacific Ocean [Docket No.: 180716668-8668-01] (RIN: 0648-BI37) received July 17, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1743. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Affairs, NMFS, Office

of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration’s final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Deep-Sea Red Crab Fishery; 2019 Atlantic Deep-Sea Red Crab Specifications [Docket No.: 160920861-8999-04] (RIN: 0648-XE900) received July 17, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1744. A letter from the Assistant Director, Office of Policy, Executive Office of Immigration Review, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Board of Immigration Appeals: Affirmance Without Opinion, Referral for Panel Review, and Publication of Decisions as Precedents [EOIR Docket No.: 159; AG Order No.: 4478-2019] (RIN: 1125-AA58) received July 17, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1745. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Executive Office for Immigration Review, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department’s interim final rule — Asylum eligibility and Procedural Modifications [EOIR Docket No.: 19-0504; A.G. Order No.: 4488-2019] (RIN: 1125-AA91) received July 17, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1746. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace, Boulder City, NV [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0816; Airspace Docket No.: 18-AWP-7] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received July 18, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1747. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31259; Amdt. No.: 3858] received July 18, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1748. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule — IFR Altitudes; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31264; Amdt. No.: 547] received July 18, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1749. A letter from the the Clerk of the House of Representatives, transmitting the annual compilation of financial disclosure statements filed by the members of the board of the Office of Congressional Ethics for the period between January 1, 2018, and December 31, 2018, pursuant to Clause 3 of

House Rule XXVI (H. Doc. No. 116—49); to the Committee on Ethics and ordered to be printed.

1750. A letter from the Regulations Policy Coordinator, Office of Regulations Policy and Management, Office of the Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Approval Criteria for Rates Charged for Community Residential Care (RIN: 2900-AP63) received July 18, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1751. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medicare and Medicaid Programs; Revision of Requirements for Long-Term Care Facilities: Arbitration Agreements [CMS-3342-F] (RIN: 0938-AT18) received July 17, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. TAKANO: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 2942. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out the Women's Health Transition Training pilot program through at least fiscal year 2020, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 116-166, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DEFAZIO: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 1307. A bill to provide for an online repository for certain reporting requirements for recipients of Federal disaster assistance, and for other purposes (Rept. 116-167, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. NADLER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 549. A bill to designate Venezuela under section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to permit nationals of Venezuela to be eligible for temporary protected status under such section, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 116-168). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. NADLER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2938. A bill to exempt from the calculation of monthly income certain benefits paid by the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Department of Defense (Rept. 116-169). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. NADLER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3304. A bill to exempt for an additional 4-year period, from the application of the means-test presumption of abuse under chapter 7, qualifying members of reserve components of the Armed Forces and members of the National Guard who, after September 11, 2001, are called to active duty or to perform a homeland defense activity for not less than 90 days (Rept. 116-170). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. NADLER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3311. A bill to amend chapter 11 of title 11, United States Code, to address reorganization of small businesses, and for other purposes (Rept. 116-171). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DEFAZIO: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 3409. A bill to

authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 116-172). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PALLONE: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 3375. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to clarify the prohibitions on making robocalls, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 116-173). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PALLONE: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 2507. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize certain programs under part A of title XI of such Act relating to genetic diseases, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 116-174). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PALLONE: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 2035. A bill to amend title XXIX of the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the program under such title relating to lifespan respite care; with an amendment (Rept. 116-175). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PALLONE: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 776. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the Emergency Medical Services for Children program (Rept. 116-176). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PALLONE: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 1058. A bill to reauthorize certain provisions of the Public Health Service Act relating to autism, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 116-177). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mrs. TORRES of California: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 509. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 397) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to create a Pension Rehabilitation Trust Fund, to establish a Pension Rehabilitation Administration within the Department of the Treasury to make loans to multiemployer defined benefit plans, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3239) to require U.S. Customs and Border Protection to perform an initial health screening on detainees, and for other purposes; providing for proceedings during the period from July 29, 2019, through September 6, 2019; and for other purposes (Rept. 116-178). Referred to the House Calendar.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committees on Small Business and Financial Services discharged from further consideration. H.R. 1307 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committees on Armed Services discharged from further consideration. H.R. 2942 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia (for himself and Ms. ADAMS):

H.R. 3876. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure the solvency of the Black Lung Disability Trust Fund by ex-

tending the excise tax on coal; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YARMUTH (for himself and Mr. NEAL):

H.R. 3877. A bill to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, to establish a congressional budget for fiscal years 2020 and 2021, to temporarily suspend the debt limit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself and Mrs. DINGELL):

H.R. 3878. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to clarify the process for registrants to exercise due diligence upon discovering a suspicious order, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. HAALAND (for herself, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. GALLEGOS, Mr. STEWART, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. GIANFORTE, Mrs. DINGELL, and Mr. LAMALFA):

H.R. 3879. A bill to modify the procedures for issuing special recreation permits for certain public land units, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DELGADO (for himself and Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 3880. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the deduction for health insurance costs in computing self-employment taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. FRANKEL (for herself, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. WEBER of Texas):

H.R. 3881. A bill to amend section 214(c)(8) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to modify the data reporting requirements relating to nonimmigrant employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Ms. FRANKEL, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. ESCOBAR, Ms. HAALAND, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Ms. TITUS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CISNEROS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. DEAN, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. COHEN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. MOULTON, and Ms. MATSUD):

H.R. 3882. A bill to amend the Ted Stevens Olympic and Amateur Sports Act to provide pay equity for amateur athletes and other personnel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONNOLLY (for himself and Mr. BISHOP of Utah):

H.R. 3883. A bill to establish the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations of the

United States to facilitate the fullest cooperation, coordination, and mutual accountability among all levels of government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CORREA, Ms. DEAN, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. ESCOBAR, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. EVANS, Ms. GABBARD, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. WATERS, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN):

H.R. 3884. A bill to decriminalize and deschedule cannabis, to provide for reinvestment in certain persons adversely impacted by the War on Drugs, to provide for expungement of certain cannabis offenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Agriculture, Education and Labor, Ways and Means, Small Business, Natural Resources, and Oversight and Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. GABBARD:

H.R. 3885. A bill to amend the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 to defer part of the compensation of senior employees of large bank holding companies (and their subsidiaries) for 10 years, to use such deferred amounts to pay any civil or criminal fines that may be levied on the bank holding company (or subsidiary), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MCADAMS (for himself and Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH):

H.R. 3886. A bill to amend the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 to provide a temporary exemption for low-revenue issuers from certain auditor attestation requirements; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CLYBURN (for himself, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. KHANNA, and Ms. CLARKE of New York):

H.R. 3887. A bill to discharge the qualified loan amounts of each individual, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. RODGERS of Washington (for herself and Mr. MCNERNEY):

H.R. 3888. A bill to require the Administrator of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration to conduct a study on motor vehicle safety and impaired driving, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ROUDA (for himself and Mr. MEADOWS):

H.R. 3889. A bill to amend the Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 1998 to make technical corrections; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BUCSHON (for himself and Mrs. DINGELL):

H.R. 3890. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to provide funds to address

motor vehicle safety and impaired driving, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HARDER of California (for himself and Mr. REED):

H.R. 3891. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to make college affordable and accessible; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HARDER of California:

H.R. 3892. A bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to award competitive grants for the purpose of developing, offering, improving, and providing educational or career pathway programs for workers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HARDER of California:

H.R. 3893. A bill to direct the Secretary of Education to establish a program that awards grants to State coalitions that build or expand career pathways programs in schools within the State, and to direct the Secretary of Education to establish a program that awards grants to eligible agencies to carry out career pathways programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 3894. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to prohibit sewage dumping into the Great Lakes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. VARGAS (for himself, Mr. PETERS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mr. LEVIN of California):

H.R. 3895. A bill to provide for a general capital increase for the North American Development Bank, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LIPINSKI (for himself and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 3896. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide that only citizens or nationals of the United States may operate trains within the United States that originate in Mexico; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 3897. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the monthly housing stipend under the Post-9/11 Educational Assistance Program for individuals who pursue programs of education solely through distance learning on more than a half-time basis; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BOST (for himself and Ms. FINKENAUER):

H.R. 3898. A bill to require the Corps of Engineers to consider benefits to navigation to be gained by certain projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BROOKS of Alabama (for himself and Mr. GOSAR):

H.R. 3899. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to modify the procedure to designate a foreign state, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 3900. A bill to amend the Children's Online Privacy Protection Act of 1998 to strengthen protections relating to the online collection, use, and disclosure of personal information of children and minors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. JUDY CHU of California (for herself, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. CASE, Mr. TED LIEU of California, and Mr. TAKANO):

H.R. 3901. A bill to amend the Education Sciences and Reform Act of 2002 to include racial subgroups in IPEDS data, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself and Mr. HILL of Arkansas):

H.R. 3902. A bill to provide standards for physical condition and management of housing receiving assistance payments under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. DeLAURO:

H.R. 3903. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the dollar limitation on the exclusion for employer-provided dependent care assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. FOX of North Carolina:

H.R. 3904. A bill to amend titles 23 and 49, United States Code, to repeal wage requirements applicable to laborers and mechanics employed on Federal-aid highway and public transportation construction projects; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HIGGINS of New York (for himself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. DEMINGS, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. COHEN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WILD, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. ROSE of New York):

H.R. 3905. A bill to amend title VII of the Social Security Act to require the President to transmit the annual budget of the Social Security Administration without revisions to Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. JAYAPAL:

H.R. 3906. A bill to prohibit the expansion of immigration detention facilities, to improve the oversight of such facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, and Mr. WALKER):

H.R. 3907. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish the Insider Threat Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. KINZINGER (for himself, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. YOHO):

H.R. 3908. A bill to increase the long-term fiscal accountability of direct spending legislation; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LANGEVIN (for himself, Ms. BASS, and Mr. BACON):

H.R. 3909. A bill to amend subpart 2 of part B of title IV of the Social Security Act to authorize grants to eligible entities to develop and implement statewide or tribal post-adoption and post-legal guardianship mental health service programs for all children who are adopted or placed in legal guardianship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEWIS (for himself, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. EVANS, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. SUOZZI, and Ms. SÁNCHEZ):

H.R. 3910. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to improve access to care for all Medicare and Medicaid beneficiaries through models tested under the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Innovation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LEWIS (for himself and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska):

H.R. 3911. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act and the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 to expand and expedite access to cardiac rehabilitation programs and pulmonary rehabilitation programs under the Medicare program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LEWIS (for himself and Mr. BUCHANAN):

H.R. 3912. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to increase awareness, expand preventative services, and improve care for individuals with end stage renal disease, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. LOFGREN:

H.R. 3913. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to provide grants for education programs on the history of the treatment of Italian Americans during World War II; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. LOFGREN:

H.R. 3914. A bill to apologize for the treatment of Italian Americans during World War II; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUCAS (for himself, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. BAIRD, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mr. GONZÁLEZ of Ohio, Mr. BACON, and Mr. WOODALL):

H.R. 3915. A bill to amend the America COMPETES Act to reauthorize the Advanced Research Projects Agency-Energy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. LUJÁN (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. COLE, and Ms. MCCOLLUM):

H.R. 3916. A bill to provide for a study on the protection of Native American seeds and traditional foods, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MATSUI (for herself, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. HAALAND, Ms. SCHA-KOWSKY, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. RUSH, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. WILD, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RYAN, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. ROSE of New York, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. COHEN, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. MENG, Mr. MORELLE, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. FRANKEL, Ms. ESCOBAR, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. CRIST, Ms. SHALALA, Mr. SRES, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Mr. BERA, Mr. PETERS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. MOORE, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms.

WEXTON, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Mr. KILDEE):

H.R. 3917. A bill to prohibit the use of funds for the 2026 World Cup unless the United States Soccer Federation provides equitable pay to the members of the United States Women's National Team and the United States Men's National Team; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. MENG (for herself, Ms. MOORE, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. WELCH, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. COSTA, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. NORTON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 3918. A bill to protect the health and safety of children in immigration detention, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Homeland Security, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MOULTON (for himself and Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana):

H.R. 3919. A bill to require research in coastal sustainability and resilience, to ensure that the Federal Government continues to implement and advance coastal resiliency efforts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself and Mr. CICILLINE):

H.R. 3920. A bill to prohibit agreements between employers that directly restrict the current or future employment of any employee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PERRY:

H.R. 3921. A bill to require an institution of higher education to file a disclosure report with the Secretary of Education whenever such institution receives a gift from or enters into a contract with a foreign source, the value of which is \$50,000 or more, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. PRESSLEY:

H.R. 3922. A bill to establish American opportunity accounts, to modify estate and gift tax rules, to reform the taxation of capital income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 3923. A bill to require Federal agencies to address environmental justice, to require consideration of cumulative impacts in certain permitting decisions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Natural Resources, Transportation and Infrastructure, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SUOZZI (for himself and Mr. REED):

H.R. 3924. A bill to provide for the treatment of a pharmacy counter refusal as a coverage determination under Medicare part D; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently

determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TONKO (for himself and Mr. MCKINLEY):

H.R. 3925. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to prohibit States receiving Federal medical assistance for medication-assisted treatment under Medicaid from imposing utilization control policies or procedures with respect to such treatment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. VISCLOSKEY:

H.R. 3926. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 in order to improve the service obligation verification process for TEACH Grant recipients, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RASKIN:

H. Res. 507. A resolution affirming the validity of subpoenas duly issued and investigations undertaken by any standing or permanent select committee of the House of Representatives pursuant to authorities delegated by the Constitution and the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BAIRD (for himself, Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH, Mr. PENCE, Mr. BANKS, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, and Mr. BUCHSON):

H. Res. 508. A resolution honoring the 50th anniversary of the return of the Indiana Rangers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. KEATING):

H. Res. 510. A resolution affirming United States support to the countries of Ukraine, Georgia, and Moldova in their effort to retain political sovereignty and territorial integrity; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California (for herself, Mr. LEVIN of California, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. VARGAS):

H. Res. 511. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Department of the Navy should take a leading role in the mitigation of cross-border spills, discharges, and debris in the Tijuana River that impact national security interests of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RASKIN (for himself and Mr. MEADOWS):

H. Res. 512. A resolution calling for the global repeal of blasphemy, heresy, and apostasy laws; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RASKIN (for himself and Mr. ARMSTRONG):

H. Res. 513. A resolution recognizing the vital importance of democracy in the United States and encouraging State and local governments to aid citizens in reflecting on the contributions of democracy to a more free and stable world; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN (for herself, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. MOORE, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. SRES, and Mr. SABLAN):

H. Res. 514. A resolution committing to elevate the voices, leadership, and needs of communities that face systemic barriers in the effort to end sexual violence and support all survivors of sexual violence and gender-

based violence, including immigrant survivors, survivors who are incarcerated, survivors with disabilities, survivors of color, American Indian or Alaska Native survivors, survivors of child sexual abuse, and lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, and intersex survivors; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

112. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, relative to House Joint Resolution 15, urging Congress to pass the Daylight Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

113. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution 1, urging Congress to extend Medicaid coverage beyond 15 days for services provided in certain settings to adults with serious mental illness; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

114. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, relative to House Concurrent Resolution 5, urging the federal government to pursue policies that allow for easier reduction of excess forest fuel loads; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

115. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution 9, declaring support for the negotiated settlement agreement of federal reserved water rights claims between representatives of the Navajo Nation, the United States, and the state of Utah; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

116. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, relative to House Joint Resolution 21, reaffirming the equal political, civil, and religious rights and privileges granted by the Utah Constitution for both men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

117. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, relative to Senate Joint Resolution 9, requesting the Congress of the United States call a convention of the states to propose amendments to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

118. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, relative to House Joint Resolution 7, requesting the Congress of the United States call a convention of the states to propose amendments to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

119. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution 7, urging the President of the United States and Congress to remove barriers that prohibit the medical cannabis industry from legally accessing banking services; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and the Judiciary.

120. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, relative to House Resolution 3, urging a humane response to the humanitarian crises at the U.S.-Mexico border; jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary and Homeland Security.

121. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, relative to House Concurrent Resolution 3, requesting that Congress allow states to regulate certain switcher locomotive emission standards; jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Energy and Commerce.

122. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, relative to House Joint

Resolution 14, encouraging Utah's state and congressional delegations to continue supporting legislation and practices that enhance electrical grid security against natural, accidental, or intentional occurrences, including disruption from electromagnetic pulses, that could potentially interrupt reliable electricity services; jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Energy and Commerce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

H.R. 3876.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. YARMUTH:

H.R. 3877.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1; Article 1, Section 8, Clause 2; Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18; and Article 1, Section 9, Clause 7 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 3878.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

Section 8—Powers of Congress. To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. HAALAND:

H.R. 3879.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 and Article IV, Section 3

By Mr. DELGADO:

H.R. 3880.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States

By Ms. FRANKEL:

H.R. 3881.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 3882.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CONNOLLY:

H.R. 3883.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 3884.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clauses 1, 3, and 18 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. GABBARD:

H.R. 3885.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The U.S. Constitution including Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. McADAMS:

H.R. 3886.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. CLYBURN:

H.R. 3887.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mrs. RODGERS of Washington:

H.R. 3888.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

By Mr. ROUDA:

H.R. 3889.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. BUCSHON:

H.R. 3890.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. 1, Sec. 8, Clause 3

By Mr. HARDER of California:

H.R. 3891.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. HARDER of California:

H.R. 3892.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. HARDER of California:

H.R. 3893.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 3894.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

“To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.”

By Mr. VARGAS:

H.R. 3895.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

(1) To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States, as enumerated in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution;

(2) To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes, as enumerated in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution;

(3) To make all laws necessary and proper for executing powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 3896.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, United States Constitution.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 3897.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States and Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 of the Constitution of the United States.

Article I, section 8 of the United State Constitution, which grants Congress the power to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; and provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia.

By Mr. BOST:

H.R. 3898.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. BROOKS of Alabama:

H.R. 3899.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 3900.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: "The Congress shall have power to . . . provide for the . . . general welfare of the United States . . .";

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: The Congress shall have power "To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes;" and

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have power "To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof."

By Ms. JUDY CHU of California:

H.R. 3901.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. 1, Sec. 8: "The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States"

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 3902.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 3903.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

As described in Article 1, Section 1 "all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives."

By Ms. FOXX of North Carolina:

H.R. 3904.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. HIGGINS of New York:

H.R. 3905.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States of America

By Ms. JAYAPAL:

H.R. 3906.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 3907.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. KINZINGER:

H.R. 3908.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 Clause 18

By Mr. LANGEVIN:

H.R. 3909.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. LEWIS:

H.R. 3910.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. LEWIS:

H.R. 3911.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. LEWIS:

H.R. 3912.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Ms. LOFGREN:

H.R. 3913.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 To make all laws that shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Ms. LOFGREN:

H.R. 3914.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 To make all laws that shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. LUCAS:

H.R. 3915.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 8, Clause 18:

"The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, of in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. LUJÁN:

H.R. 3916.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Ms. MATSUI:

H.R. 3917.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 3918.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution

By Mr. MOULTON:

H.R. 3919.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 3920.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. PERRY:

H.R. 3921.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. PRESSLEY:

H.R. 3922.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the US Constitution

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 3923.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Mr. SUOZZI:

H.R. 3924.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 3925.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. VISCLOSKEY:

H.R. 3926.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 34: Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 40: Ms. JUDY CHU of California and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
 H.R. 93: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 96: Ms. LEE of California and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
 H.R. 153: Mr. DUNN.
 H.R. 196: Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 295: Mr. NEGUSE.
 H.R. 307: Mr. DESJARLAIS.
 H.R. 336: Ms. CHENEY and Mr. FLEISCHMANN.
 H.R. 388: Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio.
 H.R. 485: Mr. CUNNINGHAM.
 H.R. 500: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
 H.R. 586: Mr. GOSAR.
 H.R. 587: Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mrs. DEMINGS, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
 H.R. 593: Mr. DESAULNIER.
 H.R. 598: Mr. RICE of South Carolina.

- H.R. 616: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. BUDD, Mr. GOODEN, and Mr. PERRY.
H.R. 641: Mr. MEEKS and Mr. CISNEROS.
H.R. 645: Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. BUSTOS, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 649: Mr. LAMBORN.
H.R. 728: Mr. CASTEN of Illinois and Mr. WALDEN.
H.R. 757: Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 776: Mr. SABLAN.
H.R. 848: Mr. PERRY.
H.R. 913: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 943: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MAST, and Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio.
H.R. 959: Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 1002: Mr. BERA and Ms. SCANLON.
H.R. 1004: Mr. COX of California.
H.R. 1058: Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, and Ms. KENDRA S. Horn of Oklahoma.
H.R. 1098: Mr. MEADOWS.
H.R. 1175: Mr. TAKANO, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H.R. 1201: Mr. CISNEROS.
H.R. 1266: Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 1301: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 1309: Mr. CONNOLLY, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. PANETTA, and Mr. SCHRADER.
H.R. 1374: Mr. LONG, Mr. WENSTRUP, and Mr. BIGGS.
H.R. 1375: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 1383: Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 1444: Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana.
H.R. 1530: Mr. HOLDING and Mrs. FLETCHER.
H.R. 1534: Mrs. TRAHAN.
H.R. 1550: Mr. CISNEROS.
H.R. 1554: Mr. NEGUSE.
H.R. 1572: Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 1597: Mrs. FLETCHER, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mr. MALINOWSKI.
H.R. 1601: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 1605: Mr. BAIRD and Mr. COLE.
H.R. 1619: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
H.R. 1622: Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 1628: Mr. WALTZ.
H.R. 1643: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 1682: Mr. BERA.
H.R. 1692: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 1695: Mr. BRINDISI and Mr. KELLER.
H.R. 1727: Mr. CARBAJAL.
H.R. 1762: Mr. BROWN of Maryland.
H.R. 1773: Mr. MCEACHIN, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. STANTON, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. GOLDEN, Mr. VAN DREW, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. WALDEN, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. OLSON, Mr. MEUSER, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. NEWHOUSE, and Mr. GAETZ.
H.R. 1785: Mr. GUEST.
H.R. 1811: Mr. MULLIN.
H.R. 1824: Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 1837: Ms. BASS, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Ms. Velázquez, and Mr. CLINE.
H.R. 1873: Mr. WOMACK and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 1911: Mr. WENSTRUP.
H.R. 1922: Mrs. AXNE.
H.R. 1923: Mrs. MALINOWSKI.
H.R. 1925: Ms. STEFANK, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, and Mr. ZELDIN.
H.R. 1943: Mr. CORREA.
H.R. 1966: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 1978: Mr. PANETTA.
H.R. 1980: Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. MAST, Mrs. MILLER, Mr. TIP-TON, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. KIM, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. DELGADO, Ms. SCHRIER, and Mr. LONG.
H.R. 2000: Mr. NEGUSE.
H.R. 2035: Mr. SABLAN.
H.R. 2072: Ms. CRAIG.
H.R. 2075: Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico, Mr. KIL-
DEE, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.
H.R. 2086: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 2112: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 2146: Mr. SIREs and Mr. VEASEY.
H.R. 2148: Mr. VARGAS.
H.R. 2156: Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 2191: Mr. WALTZ.
H.R. 2200: Mr. NEGUSE.
H.R. 2218: Ms. ADAMS and Ms. TLAIB.
H.R. 2250: Mrs. DINGELL.
H.R. 2258: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Penn- sylvania and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.
H.R. 2279: Mr. HARRIS and Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 2293: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. POCAN, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. MITCHELL.
H.R. 2328: Mr. CORREA and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 2382: Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Penn- sylvania, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. NEAL, and Ms. TLAIB.
H.R. 2405: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 2415: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 2441: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
H.R. 2442: Ms. SCANLON.
H.R. 2445: Mr. CLEAVER.
H.R. 2468: Mr. KINZINGER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. BARR.
H.R. 2471: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 2482: Mr. TRONE.
H.R. 2489: Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 2498: Mr. EMMER.
H.R. 2504: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 2577: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.
H.R. 2593: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 2653: Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. Craig, Mr. THOMPSON of Cali- fornia, Mr. VEASEY, and Ms. FRANKEL.
H.R. 2693: Mr. HARDER of California and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 2711: Mr. CROW.
H.R. 2741: Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 2775: Mr. SCHIFF and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H.R. 2778: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 2788: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER and Mr. MARSHALL.
H.R. 2808: Ms. MENG, Mr. NEAL, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 2850: Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.
H.R. 2912: Mrs. RADEWAGEN.
H.R. 2923: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. SAR- BANES, and Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H.R. 2938: Ms. FINKENAUER.
H.R. 2975: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Penn- sylvania.
H.R. 2977: Ms. MENG, Mr. LARSEN of Wash- ington, and Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 3000: Mr. BURGESS.
H.R. 3036: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 3040: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 3047: Mr. MULLIN.
H.R. 3073: Mr. NORCROSS and Mrs. MILLER.
H.R. 3077: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. STANTON, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mr. BALDERSON.
H.R. 3080: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 3104: Mr. MOOLENAAR, Ms. MENG, Mr. TIMMONS, and Mr. RYAN.
H.R. 3119: Mr. CISNEROS.
H.R. 3128: Mr. BANKS.
H.R. 3165: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Mrs. MCBATH.
H.R. 3195: Ms. CRAIG and Mr. NORCROSS.
H.R. 3206: Mr. MULLIN.
H.R. 3212: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 3224: Ms. WILD.
H.R. 3254: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.
H.R. 3262: Mr. COLE.
H.R. 3275: Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio.
H.R. 3281: Mr. VEASEY.
H.R. 3282: Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 3289: Mr. MULLIN.
H.R. 3303: Mr. KILDEE and Mr. BURGESS.
H.R. 3315: Mrs. DINGELL.
H.R. 3319: Mrs. WAGNER.
H.R. 3350: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. ALLRED, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. NEGUSE, and Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma.
H.R. 3356: Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 3366: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 3369: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. SLOTKIN, and Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 3374: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 3375: Mr. LAMB, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma, Mr. GOSAR, Ms. JUDY CHU of Cali- fornia, Mrs. MURPHY, Mr. KELLER, Mr. HIG- GINS of New York, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Mr. CLAY, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, and Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 3400: Mr. GRIFFITH.
H.R. 3436: Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 3447: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 3456: Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. SCHA- KOWSKY, Ms. ADAMS, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 3458: Mr. CURTIS and Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 3461: Mr. BERA.
H.R. 3464: Ms. CRAIG.
H.R. 3465: Mr. ESPAILLAT.
H.R. 3473: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. RUP- PERSBERGER.
H.R. 3493: Mr. MULLIN.
H.R. 3502: Mr. STANTON and Mr. CHABOT.
H.R. 3503: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 3510: Mr. COLE, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. KATKO, and Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 3525: Mr. SUOZZI and Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 3529: Mr. HURD of Texas and Mr. GON- ZALEZ of Texas.
H.R. 3562: Mr. KHANNA.
H.R. 3570: Mr. CLAY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. CUM- MINGS, Mr. YARMUTH, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. BROWN of Maryland.
H.R. 3575: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 3589: Mr. SCALISE.
H.R. 3597: Mr. CRIST.
H.R. 3609: Mr. PETERS, Ms. HAALAND, and Mr. LEVIN of California.
H.R. 3623: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
H.R. 3627: Mr. HUDSON.
H.R. 3660: Mr. MOULTON, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. CRIST, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 3662: Ms. CRAIG.
H.R. 3665: Mr. BUDD and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
H.R. 3668: Ms. HAALAND, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. RASKIN, and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
H.R. 3669: Mr. TAYLOR and Ms. CRAIG.
H.R. 3670: Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. WELCH, and Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mex- ico.
H.R. 3699: Mr. TAYLOR.
H.R. 3725: Mr. RASKIN.
H.R. 3731: Mr. KENNEDY and Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 3735: Mr. HARDER of California and Ms. HILL of California.
H.R. 3739: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 3742: Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, and Mr. CUNNINGHAM.
H.R. 3743: Mr. RYAN.
H.R. 3778: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. COHEN, and Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.
H.R. 3779: Mr. RICHMOND and Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 3783: Mr. SIREs.
H.R. 3788: Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana.
H.R. 3794: Mr. VAN DREW, Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico, Mr. KILDEE, and Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 3799: Mr. VEASEY.
H.R. 3808: Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 3809: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. RYAN.
H.R. 3815: Ms. PORTER and Ms. CLARKE of New York.

- H.R. 3816: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.
 H.R. 3819: Ms. NORTON, Ms. WILD, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. SUOZZI.
 H.R. 3820: Ms. HILL of California.
 H.R. 3828: Mr. WOMACK, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. WALTZ, and Mr. BAIRD.
 H.R. 3837: Mr. YOUNG.
 H.R. 3838: Ms. MENG.
 H.R. 3839: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
 H.R. 3853: Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 3862: Mr. RUSH, Mr. TAKANO, and Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 3868: Mr. CRIST.
 H.R. 3873: Mr. CROW.
 H.R. 3874: Mr. TED LIEU of California.
 H.J. Res. 35: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. SCHNEIDER.
 H.J. Res. 38: Mr. JEFFRIES.
- H.J. Res. 48: Mr. BERA.
 H. Con. Res. 20: Mr. KIM and Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania.
 H. Res. 23: Mrs. MURPHY, Mr. GUEST, and Mr. SCHRADER.
 H. Res. 33: Mr. EVANS.
 H. Res. 177: Mr. BUCSHON.
 H. Res. 189: Ms. HAALAND, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. PORTER, Mr. KHANNA, and Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico.
 H. Res. 233: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
 H. Res. 246: Mr. RICHMOND and Mrs. RADEWAGEN.
 H. Res. 300: Mr. GALLEGO.
 H. Res. 326: Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. FRANKEL, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
- H. Res. 358: Mrs. WALORSKI and Mr. TAYLOR.
 H. Res. 374: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.
 H. Res. 379: Mr. CORREA and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
 H. Res. 439: Mr. WALTZ.
 H. Res. 452: Mr. CISNEROS.
 H. Res. 493: Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. BANKS, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. WRIGHT, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. BABIN, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, and Mr. MCHENRY.
 H. Res. 496: Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
 H. Res. 502: Mr. CARSON of Indiana and Mr. GRIJALVA.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JULY 23, 2019

No. 124

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Lord of the harvest, we continue to seek You, for we desire to please You. You, O God, are our light and salvation, so we refuse to be afraid. As our lawmakers seek to walk with integrity, provide them with a harvest of truth, justice, and righteousness. May they cultivate such ethical consistency that their words will be undergirded by right actions.

Lord, keep them aware of Your continued presence as they find in You fullness of joy. Show them the path to life, as You guide them to Your desired destination.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH). The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I ask to speak as in morning business for 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF MARK T. ESPER

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, the United States of America has the mightiest military in the world to protect our freedoms and to guarantee peace around the world. That is why it is so important to keep check on the Pentagon's financial ledgers. Tax-

payers expect their money to be spent wisely, and it is our job in Congress to make sure that money is spent wisely.

I am glad Secretary Esper has said he will work with whistleblowers to stop wasteful spending and to prevent more spare parts rip-offs. These are things that have been of interest to me over the last several decades with the defense budget. I met with Secretary Esper, and I believe he has his heart in the right place to help us accomplish these goals.

He has also indicated he will prioritize getting a clean audit of our military services and an opinion that can be certified because the 2010 law that all the audits ought to be certified was not met by 2017, and they are still not done. How can you follow the money if it can't be audited?

Our men and women in uniform deserve no less than to make sure every dollar in the Defense Department is spent wisely.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

BUDGET AGREEMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, yesterday the administration informed congressional leaders that Secretary Mnuchin, White House Chief of Staff Mulvaney, and Acting OMB Director Vought reached a deal with Speaker PELOSI to prevent a government-fund-

ing crisis and deliver on President Trump's top priorities.

The agreement secures the most important priority of the Republican conference. In fact, in my view, it is the most important obligation of the entire Congress; that is, securing the resources we need to provide for the common defense. This deal does it.

Over the past 2½ years, Republicans in Congress have worked with the President to stop and reverse the decline in the strength and readiness of our Armed Forces. After years of insufficient funding that hurt readiness and tied commanders' hands, Congress and President Trump have secured badly needed funding increases to rebuild and modernize the U.S. military.

There is still more work ahead. The progress we have made remains tenuous. America's adversaries are not taking their foot off the gas anytime soon, so we can't either. We have to keep up the momentum. This agreement provides the stability of funding our military deserves and requires. Thanks to tough negotiating by the Trump administration, this deal delivers for the security of our Nation. It delivers for our men and women in uniform. It protects the progress of the last 2 years and provides the fuel for further progress. That is the bottom line.

The nature of divided government means this certainly isn't the agreement Republicans would have written all by ourselves; for example, I will never understand why our Democratic colleagues treat funding the U.S. Armed Forces like a Republican priority that somehow needs to be matched up with additional spending that Democrats like in order to make it palatable for them. It seems to me every one of us, both sides, should jump at the chance to fund defense adequately.

Alas, that is not a mystery that is going to be solved for me in the immediate future. The fact is, the Federal

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S4983

Government is coming up with urgent deadlines with respect to the debt limit and beginning the appropriations process.

The full faith and credit of the United States cannot be in question. The last thing Americans need is for Washington to throw a big wrench in this red-hot economy that is creating historic levels of job opportunities and growing their take-home pay, and so faced with our Democratic colleagues' reluctance, the Trump administration took the high road. They did what needed to be done for our Armed Forces and veterans and negotiated a successful deal. In fact, compared to current law, the administration has secured a larger increase for defense spending than for nondefense. Let me say that again: a larger increase for defense than for nondefense compared to current law.

What is more, the administration successfully kept leftwing poison pills and policy riders far away from this agreement. We know some of the far left have been hankering to claw back the Hyde amendment protections or cut away at reprogramming authorities and flexibility that Presidents rightly possess. I applaud the fact that no leftwing riders like that were allowed into the deal.

This is the deal that was necessary to continue rebuilding our national defense after years of neglect, and it is the deal that was possible in divided government. I am proud to join President Trump in support of it, and I will be proud to support it when the Senate votes on the agreement before we adjourn at the end of this month.

NOMINATION OF MARK T. ESPER

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, in the meantime, this body has other significant business to complete for the American people. Most immediately, in just a few hours, we will be confirming a new Secretary of Defense. The vote to advance Dr. Mark Esper's nomination yesterday afternoon came in at 85 to 6. That is precisely the kind of overwhelming bipartisan vote that is called for in this circumstance.

The nominee is beyond qualified. His record of public service is beyond impressive. His commitment to serving our servicemembers is beyond obvious. The need for a Senate-confirmed Secretary of Defense is beyond urgent. I urge every one of my colleagues to vote to confirm our next Secretary of Defense later today.

9/11 VICTIM COMPENSATION FUND

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, that isn't the only important task we will tackle on a bipartisan basis today. In just a few hours, the Senate will attend to an important subject we have never failed to address; that is, the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund.

I know my colleagues don't need any extended lecture from me about the

solemn commitments this program represents: commitments to the firefighters, police officers, and all the first responders who rushed selflessly toward the World Trade Center just moments after the attacks began, to the first responders and workers who reported for duty days or even weeks later, putting their health at serious risk to help others, commitments to those who responded to the Pentagon and in Shanksville, PA, as well, and in the cases where injury or illness has already claimed the lives of those heroes, commitments to the surviving families.

Congress can never repay these men, women, and families for their sacrifices, but we can do a small part to make our heroes whole. That is why the Senate has never failed to attend to the fund before. We are not about to do so now.

I had the honor of meeting with a group of first responders and advocates several weeks back. They gave me the badge of Luis Alvarez, a New York Police Department bomb squad detective who was terminally ill and has since tragically passed away.

It was my honor to receive it. It was my honor to reiterate that the Senate's ironclad commitment to getting this done was never in doubt. I told the first responders I wanted the Senate to address this prior to the August recess, and today we will do so. It will be my honor later today to vote for the funding and ensure this fund is secure. I urge my colleagues to do the same.

HONG KONG

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, on one final matter, in recent weeks, I have spoken about our Nation's renewed competition with other great powers, like Russia and China. Despite decades of efforts to welcome these nations into a peaceful, prosperous, and fair international system, we are constantly reminded that these nations have their own design on the future. In their visions, foundational principles of sovereignty, freedom, human rights, and a rules-based international order tend to take a backseat to power politics and the pursuit of hegemony.

The Chinese Communist Party, for example, is working to extend its control and influence everywhere from Taiwan to Cambodia, to Laos, to Burma, to Hong Kong, as we have seen recently. The tools and tactics may differ but the goal is the same: Beijing wants to bend its neighbors to its will.

Earlier this month, after historic protests, Hong Kong's Government hit pause on legislation that would have further eroded its autonomy and invited more meddling from the mainland, but victory for freedom and autonomy is not yet assured. The bill in question has been suspended, but it hasn't been totally withdrawn.

Hong Kong's people, emboldened by this rare victory over Beijing's creeping influence, have continued to exer-

cise their freedom of assembly to reclaim the rights, privileges, and autonomy slowly sliced away in recent years by the PRC.

Protests continue and with them countervailing pressures from authorities beholden to Beijing. Increasingly brutal police tactics and pro-mainland vigilantes are drawing blood in an effort to intimidate Hongkongers back into submission.

Hong Kong's autonomous governance, political freedoms, and stable rule of law has been a crucial precondition of its tremendous growth and prosperity. U.S. firms have invested tens of billions in Hong Kong's economy because they trust the autonomous region's political climate, independent judicial system, and degree of independence from Beijing.

By contrast, international firms are currently pulling back from China due to concerns about corruption, autocracy, intellectual property rights violations, and state-sponsored corporate espionage.

At a time when China faces slowing growth, Beijing should seek to emulate Hong Kong, not engulf Hong Kong and remake it in the image of the Chinese Communist Party.

The PRC has long been working hard under the surface to increase its influence and power. In Hong Kong, like in so many other areas, China has used this approach that experts have called "hide and bide"—hiding their intentions and biding their time, slowly slicing away resistance, building leverage, and encroaching, one step at a time.

In the case of Hong Kong, Beijing and its agents have overreached, but they are recalculating—postponing action on this legislation while biding time to resume the encroachment.

This is not just a matter of the people of Hong Kong. The PRC's treatment of Hong Kong—just like its treatment of the Uighurs or Tibetans that Beijing claims as citizens—is an indicator of how Chinese rulers will behave abroad. All nations who trade with the PRC should be watching the drama unfolding on the streets of Hong Kong.

The world is watching and wondering: If a government cannot respect the basic rights of people it claims as its own citizens, why on Earth would it be trusted to respect the rights and interests of its neighbors, its trading partners, or the companies that invest in its economy?

As we all know, the people of Hong Kong have been carrying the banner for decades. I am proud to say that here in the United States, we have been marching alongside them the entire way. Back in 1992, I was proud to author the U.S.-Hong Kong Policy Act and helped codify America's stance on the special status of Hong Kong.

So on the 70th anniversary of the PRC and the 30th anniversary of the Tiananmen Square massacre, I am grateful the administration and Congress, on a bipartisan basis, are reexamining America's relationship with

the PRC. I am grateful for the bipartisan work my colleagues have done on this important issue, and I am confident Congress will continue to hold hearings and stay vigilant on the subject of autonomy and democracy in Hong Kong, as well as China's overall strategy and its implications for the United States, our allies, and the entire world.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, last Friday, I went with a group of Senate Democrats to visit several detention centers at our southern border, including the Border Patrol facility in McAllen and processing centers at Donna and Ursula, TX. The searing accounts about the conditions endured by the migrant families are true. We saw overcrowding. We heard migrants tell us they are unable to brush their teeth, shower, call their families, or access feminine hygiene products. We saw children in soiled clothing, caged and expressionless. It is heartbreaking—the thousand-smile stares on the faces of toddlers where smiles and laughter should have been. It breaks your heart and makes your blood boil all at once.

But we saw something else. I am always looking for the positive. We saw a much better model employed by a non-profit Catholic Charities center, run by Sister Norma Pimentel. There, families had access to medicine, food, and showers as their asylum cases were being processed in an orderly fashion. These people were being treated humanely, and they were following the law.

Sister Norma told us that the government could replicate this model. She explained that if ICE reinstated the Family Case Management Program, we could see as high as 99-percent compliance with immigration court orders without the need for expanded detention and overcrowding. What a difference that could make.

Sister Norma showed us that we can treat these migrants with respect and decency without sacrificing border security or law and order. The two are not mutually exclusive. That is such an important point. You can have both humane treatment and rule of law. Anyone who says that we must choose between treating these people humanely and enforcing our laws is offering a false choice. We can do both, and

we can follow the model of Catholic Charities all along the border.

That is why Democrats have been pushing to restart and infuse more dollars into alternatives to detention despite Republican objections. The Family Case Management Program, coupled with a Democratic bill to address the treatment of children—a bill that Senators MERKLEY, FEINSTEIN, DURBIN, and I have sponsored, as well as many others—over 30 other Democrats, I believe—would both improve the conditions at the detention centers and ensure that families comply with our immigration laws.

I would say one more thing about these kids and the parents. They are not criminals. I asked Mark Morgan, who is certainly known as a hard-liner on immigration: What percentage of these kids and parents are criminals? It is a very small percentage. At one point, it was said that 96 percent—and at another point 98 percent—are not criminals. They are the same people our grandparents or our great-grandparents or our great-great-grandparents were, who sought safety and a decent life in America. Their children and their grandchildren—on my father's side I am one of the grandchildren, and on my mother's side I am one of the great-great-grandchildren—have done good things for America throughout the country. That is what America is all about. These people are not fleeing to break the law. They are not fleeing to traffic drugs. They are fleeing because the gangs down there have told the parents: We will rape your daughter, we will murder your son, and we will burn your house if you don't do what we want. They are fleeing for the safety, the beauty, and the opportunity of America, which generations since the 1600s have done and have made this country great.

We need to return to a rational discussion about the reality on the ground, and that includes a discussion about the root causes of immigration. Again, when the President says Americans should know that all of these people arriving at our borders are criminals trying to game the law, he should know who they are. As I said, Mark Morgan, his own CBP Commissioner, admitted as much to our congressional delegation on Friday when we questioned him. The vast majority of families are fleeing unimaginable violence and degradation in their countries. So let's get at the root causes of this, instead of just tweeting and going on TV and ranting, which people have done.

First, allow migrants to apply for asylum inside their own countries. Second, hire more immigration judges to reduce the backlog in cases at the border. Third, provide security assistance to these Central American countries to help them crack down on the vicious gangs and drug cartels that cause so many to flee in the first place.

This is a rational thing to do. I think most Americans, regardless of their ideology, regardless of their party, re-

gardless of their political position, would support this. But the Trump administration has now pledged to end the security assistance to Central American countries. That is counterproductive. It is boneheaded because it is going to cause more people to flee. Unfortunately, it is been typical of the President's approach. This morning, the President tweeted and bragged about how he has cut off funding to Guatemala 9 months ago. It is counterproductive. That means more—not fewer—people at our borders, plain and simple.

In my experience, I have not seen the President be serious about dealing with immigration. He has used the issue; he riles up his base without telling them the truth, making them think they are all criminals—I see this on FOX News all the time as well—demeaning immigrants, who are what America is all about, inflaming racial tensions, and stoking fear.

So we in Congress, Democrats and Republicans, should take the lead and develop a way forward, a real way that will solve the problems at the border in a way that complies with humanity, the American way, and the rule of law.

BUDGET AGREEMENT

Madam President, on a different subject, yesterday, four congressional leaders in the Trump administration reached a bipartisan agreement that will strengthen our national security and clear the way for important investments in America's middle-class—investments in healthcare, education, childcare, veterans, cancer research, and more.

First and foremost, I am pleased to report that in this deal, Democrats have finally found a way to end the threat of sequester permanently. The arbitrary and draconian limits of the sequester have hammered our ability to invest in working Americans for too long. There are large forces pushing the middle class around—globalization and automation—and the only answer, because most of our international companies haven't really made the effort at least until now, is government providing ladders—ways out, ways in, and ways up—so that average middle-class people can maintain that great American dream, which means, simply put, if you work hard, you will be doing better 10 years from now than you are doing today, and your kids will still be doing better than you. We need those kinds of programs—education, infrastructure, healthcare, and childcare—to make this happen; otherwise, these big economic forces are going to continue to push the middle-class and poor people around. The wealthy—they will do fine, even though this Republican Party and this administration seem to make them their first choice. Look at that tax cut.

So this is a good thing. It means that the shadow of sequestration, the inability of the government to provide ladders so that middle-class people can

deal with the big forces pushing them around, will no longer hover over our work on the Federal budget.

Not only did we permanently end that devastating sequester, which, by the way, the military hated, as well as people who wanted help on the domestic side—it slashed them as well. General Mattis was fanatic, almost, in a good way about this. I miss him. But we Democrats did this in an extraordinary fashion.

The agreement includes a significant increase in funding for critical domestic priorities, including an increase in the domestic budget authority that even exceeds the increase in defense by \$10 billion over the next 2 years. For those counting, yesterday's deal means that Democrats have secured over \$100 billion in funding increases for domestic programs since President Trump took office. At the same time, it ensures that our military is prepared to keep Americans safe around the world.

This \$100 billion sounds abstract. But let me tell you what it means: more funding to the States for opioid treatment. The States are desperate for more help. Young people are dying of these horrible drugs. Treatment works.

I held in my arms a father from Buffalo whose son had served in Iraq, had PTSD, and then got hooked on opioids when he came back here. Finally, the kid hit bottom. He said: Dad, I want to go to a treatment center.

Unfortunately, there was a 23-week waiting period, and the young man killed himself in the 22nd week. The father cried in my arms, a big steel worker with tattoos and everything else. He was devastated, as anybody else would be over the loss of a child. Now there will be more money for that. This is not abstract.

What about fixing VA hospitals? What about more money to help educate our kids properly? What about some money to make the burden of college less great, as heavy as it is? What about money for climate and clean energy? What about money for infrastructure and transportation? That \$100 billion is not abstract. It is for all of these things. It is going to mean jobs for the American people. It is going to mean ladders up for the American people. It is going to mean some hope for the American people.

I know that on the other side some on the right will say: This increases the deficit. Just a year ago they voted to increase the deficit by \$1.5 trillion—now, maybe \$2 trillion—with a deep tax cut, the overwhelming part of which went to the wealthiest people in America. So don't start hollering "deficit" when it comes to helping the middle class when you are willing to deepen the deficit when it comes to helping the wealthy. Of course, now, part of this is that the debt ceiling will be extended until the summer of 2021, preserving the full faith and credit of the United States.

Looking forward, I think we have laid the groundwork for legislation

that will hopefully avoid another senseless and harmful government shutdown. The House will now move quickly to put this agreement up for a vote, and then the Senate can follow suit and send it to the President's desk. I was glad to see that the President tweeted—I believe it was tweeted—and put out a statement that he supports this agreement.

9/11 VICTIM COMPENSATION FUND

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, finally, there is something we can vote on today at long, long last—the 9/11 Victim Compensation Fund for those brave heroes who rushed to the Towers on 9/11. The light at the end of the tunnel of what has been a very long and sometimes very dark time is now only a few hours away. We have waited too long to settle this matter. Too many people have put up bipartisan roadblocks along the road.

Now we are here, about to exit the tunnel and guarantee once and for all that the heroes who rushed to the Towers 18 years ago will no longer have to worry about compensation for their families when they are gone. These men and women, many of them sick, some of them gravely so, will not have to return to Congress anymore to fight for the compensation they always should have been given. They will be able to go home, tend to their illnesses, their family members, and their friends. That is what they always wanted to do—just take care of themselves, their families, and their friends who got sick from the poisonous stuff that was in the air right after 9/11, when, bravely, these men and women rushed to the Towers. That is what we want. We have waited too long.

Now, we are going to have a few amendment votes first, and I warn my colleagues on both sides of the aisle: If you vote for these amendments, you will, at best, delay the bill but, at worst, kill it. Neither is a good choice, neither is a palatable choice, and neither is an acceptable choice. Let's defeat these amendments. I believe they will be defeated. Then, let's pass the bill overwhelmingly.

This body has come together to help veterans time and again. These people are just like veterans, and 9/11 seemed like a war. I was there. I was there the next day. I was in Washington the day it happened. In a time of war, these brave people selflessly risked their lives and rushed to the Towers to defend our freedom, just like our soldiers do and just like our armed services do. So we should sign this bill into law.

Now, I will have more to say on the matter before and after the vote, about what this means, and thanking the many people, particularly the first responders—names like Zadroga, Pfeifer, and Alvarez—who made this happen. Until then, let me just say it is hard for me to express how much I am looking forward to passing this bill here today.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

NEVER FORGET THE HEROES: JAMES ZADROGA, RAY PFEIFER, AND LUIS ALVAREZ PERMANENT AUTHORIZATION OF THE SEPTEMBER 11TH VICTIM COMPENSATION FUND ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 1327, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1327) to extend authorization for the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001 through fiscal year 2092, and for other purposes.

NOMINATION OF MARK T. ESPER

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, later this morning we will be voting on the nomination of Mark Esper to be Secretary of Defense. Dr. Esper is an outstanding choice. I don't need to tell anyone how essential the position of Secretary of Defense is to our national security. The Secretary of Defense is key to ensuring that our Nation is prepared to meet and defeat any threat. Dr. Esper has the experience, the knowledge, and the character for the job. He has an illustrious resume: West Point grad, Gulf war veteran, Bronze Star recipient, Rifle Company commander, a total of 10 years on Active Duty, and an additional 11 in the National Guard and Army Reserve.

In addition to his practical military and leadership experience, he has extensive experience on the policy side of things as well. He has a master's degree from the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard and a doctorate in public policy from George Washington University here in the Nation's Capital. He worked as a senior professional staff member on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the Governmental Affairs Committee, as policy director for the House Armed Services Committee, and as national security adviser to former Senate Majority Leader Bill Frist. He also served

as a Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense during the George W. Bush administration, and during the Trump administration, of course, he has served as Secretary of the Army.

As Army Secretary, he has driven budget reform and Army modernization, supported Defense cooperation with our allies, and supervised the most significant reorganization of the Army in 45 years. His character and his expertise have won him respect from both sides of the aisle.

The Democratic junior Senator from Virginia recently described Dr. Esper as “a person of sound character and moral courage” and encouraged his colleagues to support Dr. Esper’s nomination.

Reacting to Dr. Esper’s appointment as Acting Defense Secretary, the Democratic chairman of the House Armed Services Committee noted that the Department of Defense would benefit from Dr. Esper’s leadership.

Dr. Esper was confirmed as Secretary of the Army by an overwhelming bipartisan majority, and his nomination as Defense Secretary was reported out of the Senate Armed Services Committee with nearly unanimous support. I look forward to seeing a similarly strong bipartisan vote for his confirmation later today.

In November 2018, the bipartisan National Defense Strategy Commission released a report warning that our readiness had eroded to the point where we might struggle to win a war against a major power like China or Russia. The Commission noted that we would be especially vulnerable if we were called on to fight a war on two fronts.

Rebuilding our military and equipping it to meet 21st century threats has to be a priority. I was encouraged yesterday by the fact that the budget deal arrived at by the administration and Speaker PELOSI prioritizes money for our military. While it is not a perfect piece of legislation, it will ensure that we are able to keep rebuilding our military and deliver on-time funding for our men and women in uniform.

During his confirmation hearing, Dr. Esper revealed his clear understanding of what needs to be done on the national security front: modernize and rebuild our military; ensure that we are prepared for a new era of great-power competition while maintaining our ability to confront terrorist organizations and rogue nations; cultivate our relationship with our allies; and support our men and women in uniform, who sacrifice so much to keep our Nation safe and free.

I am confident that Dr. Esper will be an outstanding Secretary of Defense, and I look forward to supporting his nomination later today.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

NOMINATION OF STEPHEN M. DICKSON

Ms. CANTWELL. Madam President, I rise today to speak in opposition to the

nomination of Stephen Dickson to be the next Administrator of the FAA.

I have said that it is very important that in this day and age, when it comes to aviation, safety must always be our top priority. We considered Mr. Dickson’s nomination, his record, and the ongoing case of a whistleblower retaliation, and given all of that, it is clear to me that he is not the right person for the safety culture we need today at the FAA.

It is distressing to me that Mr. Dickson advanced out of committee on just a party-line vote. We have never had a partisan vote on an FAA nominee in the past, and I believe we should have found consensus on the nominee for the FAA given all the concerns the public has about flying safety.

The reason why I oppose Mr. Dickson is from what I understood, after the hearing, from First Officer Karlene Petitt, who has a Ph.D. in aviation safety and is an experienced pilot over 40 years and happens to be one of my constituents. At a hearing, we basically understood that no one was holding Mr. Dickson accountable for actions that he took against her at Delta Airlines.

Back in 2010, she was a pilot on an A330 flight. She had seen a crash of an A330 plane—tragically, an Air France plane in the Atlantic Ocean. She had also heard comments from those in the Delta executive team that if you have a concern about safety, say something. So she thought she was doing just that.

As part of what she thought was important information following these A330 incidents, she said she had concern about pilot training when it came to potential automation and failures of making sure that they were giving enough rest time to pilots. She observed that there were issues she thought were putting both her and passengers at risk.

So what did she do? She did what all employees, we hope, would do. She informed her superiors and suggested possible solutions. She was persistent and wanted to make sure that these recommendations were met with by the leadership of the organization—Mr. Dickson and his second-in-command, Jim Graham. Some of the concerns she raised about inadequate pilot training and not enough pilot rest were things that you thought would have maybe gotten her recognized for the great contribution to a safety culture that is so necessary today in an age of more and more automation. Whether you are talking about an automobile or an airplane, it is essential that automation and training go hand in hand.

Instead of Officer Petitt getting the attention she deserved, the company sent her for a mandatory psychiatric evaluation. Can you imagine a whistleblower bringing up concerns as a pilot flying for many years and instead of being paid attention to, being sent for a psychiatric evaluation?

Just a few months after Officer Petitt raised her concerns, that is ex-

actly what happened. Delta and Mr. Dickson removed her from duty and required her to undergo a mental health evaluation, forcing her to protect her career and her reputation.

The psychiatrist Mr. Dickson’s team handpicked to examine Ms. Petitt had his own problems of serious red flags and retaliatory threats. For example, the doctor cited that just because Officer Petitt had three kids, a job, and helped her husband with his career, she must be manic. I don’t know about the Presiding Officer, but to me it just sounds like being an American woman today, juggling many things.

The psychiatrist even had the nerve to ask when the first officer was pumping breast milk for her children. That is the kind of questioning the officer had to answer.

The good news is that there are laws on the books that protect people in these kinds of incidents when they are a whistleblower and they have been retaliated against.

Later, a panel of eight doctors from the Mayo Clinic and another independent doctor came to the opposite conclusion of this psychiatrist, stating that Officer Petitt had no mental issues and that she should continue to fly as she had done for many years.

It is very unfortunate that this situation arose, but it is more unfortunate that Mr. Dickson was not evenhanded about it when his nomination came before the committee. It is standard operating procedure in the U.S. Senate to ask nominees this question: Have you or any business or nonprofit that you have been associated with been involved as a party to an administrative agency, criminal, or civil litigation?

Why do we want to know that? We want to know of any kind of derogatory information about a nominee whom we are about to entrust with the public confidence through the U.S. Senate. We want to know whether there have been any issues and whether that trust has been misplaced. Instead of answering that question, he did not bring up this incident at Delta.

I don’t know of any nominee before the Commerce Committee who, having failed to disclose this kind of information, then moved forward after it was brought up. That is right. The only reason we knew about this incident is not because of his requirement to disclose it and his failure to disclose it but because, during the hearing when everybody heard all of this glowing information, a whistleblower came forward to explain to members of the committee that this incident took place and exactly what had happened to her in her career as she tried to raise important issues.

When Mr. Dickson was asked for further information about this lawsuit and why he didn’t disclose it, he went on to minimize his involvement, saying that it amounted to essentially one meeting with the pilot; however, a review of written records, emails, depositions, and other materials showed that

Mr. Dickson was more involved than just one meeting.

We all want our officials to show a commitment to safety, establishing rules and a culture that protects the flying public. That is one reason Captain Sullenberger has come out against this nominee. He knows that when it comes to creating a culture of safety, it has to start at the top, and we have to listen to people like the pilots who are showing concerns today about the Boeing 737 MAX. We should listen to them and the inspector general on what types of processes should be put in place to resolve the challenges we face as we integrate more automation.

Automation can help us make things safer, but automation without the pilot training, without the integration, without a culture that rewards people for bringing up issues, instead of almost red-coding them as a response, is not what we need to be doing.

A 2016 report by the Department of Transportation inspector general highlights the essential role of FAA oversight to reduce the hazards with regard to increased reliance on flight deck automation. The FAA estimates that automation is used 90 percent of the time in flight. Yet, according to the inspector general report, the FAA did not have a process to ensure that airline pilots are properly trained to use and monitor automation systems while maintaining proficiency in manual flight operations.

The report recommended that the FAA provide guidance in defining standards that airlines can use to train and evaluate pilots in the use of automation. It also recommended that standards be established to determine whether pilots were receiving sufficient training to develop and maintain manual flying skills.

These are the very matters First Officer Petitt had focused on when making her observations and suggestions regarding safety. They are as critical today as they were for the A330.

We are living in an era of increasing automation, and we have work to do. I guarantee that we are going to continue to play a role in this in the Commerce Committee, making sure the inspector general's criticisms of the FAA with regard to these issues are addressed. We need someone on the front-line who takes safety seriously and listens to the pilots. I know these issues are weighing on the American public—the very questions that Dr. Petitt asked. I am sure, with the right amount of engineering and cooperation, we can get them right.

But Mr. Dickson has doubled down. He basically said that he had no regrets about how he handled the situation when we came back at him about the fact that the information wasn't submitted. He basically said he had no regrets about trying to end a 40-year career of a whistleblower. I find this very challenging. I want the FAA to move forward with confidence that we are going to create the safety culture necessary for today's environment.

Captain Sullenberger said it best:

This nominee, while a senior executive at Delta Airlines, either caused or allowed a whistleblower with validated safety concerns to be retaliated against. I strongly oppose his nomination. The decisions the next FAA Administrator makes will determine how safe every airline passenger and crew will be.

I know that it is hard for people in busy jobs to slow down and listen to whistleblowers, but I guarantee they have helped us many times to solve many problems.

I ask my colleagues to turn down this nomination today and to help us create an environment where whistleblowers will be listened to.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT of Florida). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ENCRYPTION

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, today I rise to rebut the deeply flawed proposal the Attorney General made this morning. This morning, he raised a tired, debunked plan to blow a hole in one of the most important security features protecting the digital lives of the American people. Mr. Barr—once again echoing the views of some on the far, far right—is trying to undermine strong encryption and require government back doors into the personal devices of the American people.

“Encryption” is a technical term that gets thrown around by people in government who don't want you to use it. The idea, however, is simple: It is using math to encode your information so that the only people who can read it are the ones you want to read it.

As is often known, encryption is used every time a credit card is swiped or an online bank account is accessed. It helps protect our kids from predators who would spy on them through their cell phone cameras or surreptitiously track their movements. It keeps our health records, our personal communications, and our other sensitive data secure from hackers. Strong encryption helps protect national security secrets from hackers working for the Russians, the Chinese, the North Koreans, and other hostile governments.

I have spent a full decade fighting off horrible plans to undermine strong encryption. My usual argument goes something like this: You can't build a back door only for the good guys, for government officials who are trying to protect people. Once you weaken encryption with a back door, you make it far easier for criminals and hackers and predators to get into your digital life. Then I go through all the reasons the government's plan to build a back door is just about the worst idea since Crystal Pepsi.

Today, I want to raise some even more pressing concerns that are new. Many times in the past, I have warned that unnecessary government surveillance holds the potential to be abused, but I have never done what I am doing today. Today, I fear—rather, I expect that if we give the Attorney General and the President the unprecedented power to break encryption across the board and burrow into the most intimate details of Americans' lives, they will abuse those powers. I don't say that lightly. Yet, when I look at the record, the public statements, and the behavior of William Barr and Donald Trump, it is clear to me that you can't make the case for giving them this kind of power. There is too much evidence that they will abuse it. Their record shows they do not feel constrained by the law. They have not been bound by legal or moral precedents. Donald Trump, by his own words, has no ethical compunction—these are his words—about using government power against his political enemies.

Never before have I been so certain that an administration in power would knowingly abuse the massive power of government surveillance. It is for that reason that building government back doors into the encrypted communications of the American people is now uniquely dangerous and must be opposed at all costs.

These are serious charges that I have made, and I am going to walk through my reasoning. First, I would like to discuss the Attorney General's history when it comes to government surveillance and government power.

When this body voted on Mr. Barr's nomination earlier this year, I laid out in great detail his history when it comes to Executive power. Anyone wishing for a full airing of Mr. Barr's lifelong devotion to unbounded Executive power can dial up those remarks of mine on C-SPAN, but I just want to highlight one item again this morning.

Mr. Barr testified in October of 2003, and he laid out his ideological position that the President is not restrained when it comes to surveilling people here in the United States—not by laws passed by Congress, not by the Fourth Amendment, no constraints.

In that 2003 testimony, Mr. Barr said that the PATRIOT Act didn't go far enough in terms of government surveillance. Even worse, Mr. Barr said that laws going back to the 1970s have no real effect on Presidential power. Mr. Barr said: “Numerous statutes were passed, such as FISA”—Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act—“that purported to supplant Presidential discretion with Congressionally crafted schemes whereby judges become the arbiter of national security decisions.” In one sentence, Mr. Barr just swept 40 years of congressional action and 200 years of constitutional governance out the window. We ought to take him at his word that he has contempt for the Fourth Amendment and critical laws that protect our law-abiding people.

It is far more than just words, however, that lead me to this conclusion. It is now public record that William Barr, when he was Attorney General in the 1990s, approved a massive, illegal surveillance program.

The inspector general at the Department of Justice revealed this March that William Barr gave the OK to a bulk phone records dragnet at the Drug Enforcement Agency that ran for more than 20 years. The inspector general found that Mr. Barr never even looked to see whether that Drug Enforcement Administration bulk surveillance program was legal. The inspector general called it “troubling” because of the disconnect between what the law says and how it was secretly being interpreted and used. The Drug Enforcement Agency program that William Barr approved relied on subpoena power that requires that the records being collected be “relevant or material” to an investigation. But Mr. Barr didn’t bother to consider whether all of those phone records that were collected in bulk were consistent with the law; he just went ahead and rubberstamped it.

The inspector general tends to be polite about outright calling government programs illegal, but even the inspector general pointed out that there are multiple court cases that “clearly suggested potential challenges to the validity of the DEA’s use of this statutory subpoena power in this expansive, non-targeted manner.”

Finally, the inspector general found that the records collected from the program were used outside the Drug Enforcement Agency for investigations that had nothing to do with drugs—a practice the inspector general said “raised significant legal questions.”

The inspector general goes on to note that Congress was kept almost entirely in the dark. At a time when the American people are hungry for transparency and openness and accountability, the inspector general says Congress was kept in the dark by Mr. Barr about a decades-long, illegal bulk collection program, with the exception of a single secret Intelligence Committee hearing in 2007. Even then, it was obvious the program was illegal. That is why my colleague Senator Feingold and I wrote to the head of National Intelligence pointing out that the subpoena authority the DEA was using was never intended for bulk collection. This was secret law, and it was wrong and dangerous.

That is why I wanted to make sure people knew Mr. Barr’s history, because this secret, illegal bulk collection program was approved by the current Attorney General. So you have an Attorney General who not only has said he is not constrained by the law, but he has a history of breaking the law. You also have a President who almost every day expresses contempt for any legal or constitutional restraints on his powers. That attitude applies to surveillance too. In 2016, in response to

Russian hacking of his opponents, Donald Trump said: “I wish I had that power.”

So Donald Trump—a President who Attorney General Barr thinks can do no wrong—is the one who is driving this. This is the President who Attorney General Barr thinks is above the law. This is the President whom the Attorney General will, in effect, cover for at virtually every turn, as he did when he repeatedly lied about the contents of the Mueller report.

Let me close by talking about why this matters to William Barr’s efforts now to break into Americans’ encrypted communications. The argument that the government needs to weaken encryption has always been based on the promise that the government will never use the back door without a court-ordered warrant.

Yet Mr. Barr, in his own words and actions, has demonstrated repeatedly, when it comes to surveillance, that the laws don’t matter, that the courts don’t matter, and that even the Constitution doesn’t matter. The only thing that matters is what he and the President feel like doing.

So I would ask my colleagues who are here, what Senators in their right minds would give these men the authority to break into the phone of every single American? Imagine what kind of information they could gather on their political opponents. Imagine if a Member of Congress were secretly gay and were desperate to hide the fact. Despite campaigning on family values, imagine if a Member of Congress had cheated on his wife. Would a man like the individual I have described here use that information against them? Would Donald Trump use it to secure their loyalty in the face of his own wrongdoing?

I understand that the world is a frightening place, and anybody who serves on the Select Committee on Intelligence would share that view. Some government agencies will always advocate for greater powers to surveil Americans and intrude into their digital lives. It is important to remember, as I touched on in the beginning, that the banning of encryption in America will not stop the bad guys from using encryption, and it will not ban basic math algorithms elsewhere in the world. It will only leave Americans less secure against foreign hackers, and—I regret having to say this—it will leave Americans less secure against intrusions by an administration that has shown it is willing to support lawless measures.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

MAIDEN SPEECH

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. President, I am honored to rise to deliver my maiden speech as the senior U.S. Senator from the great State of Arizona. I was sworn in to this distinguished body just over 6 months ago. I am incredibly honored and humbled to join only a dozen oth-

ers who have had the honor of representing the great State 48 in the U.S. Senate, and I am filled with gratitude to the people of the State who have entrusted me with this duty. In continuing the work of leaders who have held the Senate seat, from Senators Barry Goldwater and Dennis DeConcini to, most recently, Senators Jon Kyl and Jeff Flake, I have pledged to uphold Arizona’s proud tradition of putting country above party.

Most new Senators deliver their maiden speeches soon after being sworn in. I have waited so I could use these 6 months to demonstrate to Arizonans, in actions more than words, exactly how I intend to serve our State in the Senate. I promised Arizona that I would do things differently than have others in Washington.

Americans see a lot of chaos in this city. There is intense pressure from all sides to spend time and energy on every scandal, every insult, every tweet, and every partisan fight, and it is very easy to get distracted. It is the simplest thing in the world to line up on either side of a partisan battle. What is harder, though, is to ignore the chaos and get out of our comfort zones to build coalitions and get things done. I promised Arizona I would do the hard work, and that approach has produced results.

In these first 6 months, two bills I have sponsored to improve protections and services for veterans have passed the Senate and the House, and they now await the President’s signature to put them into law. These new measures expand American Legion membership to veterans across the country, protect veterans from scam artists, and help veterans achieve the dream of home ownership. Few efforts better illustrate my approach to service or are more worthy of our attention than that of the Somers family.

As a Congresswoman, I shared the story of SGT Daniel Somers on the floor of the U.S. House, and I will now share that story for the first time on the floor of the Senate.

Sergeant Somers was an Arizona Army veteran who served two tours in Iraq. He served on Task Force Lightning, an intelligence unit, and ran more than 400 combat missions as a machine gunner in the turret of a humvee. Part of his role required him to interrogate dozens of terror suspects. His work was deemed classified.

Like many veterans, Sergeant Somers was haunted by the war when he returned home. He suffered from flashbacks, nightmares, depression, and other symptoms of post-traumatic stress disorder—all made worse by a traumatic brain injury. Sergeant Somers needed help.

He and his family did what all families who face similar challenges are urged to do—they asked for help. Yet, when the VA’s answer came, it demonstrated exactly what happens when America’s veterans are left behind. The VA enrolled Sergeant Somers in group

therapy sessions—sessions he could not attend for fear of his disclosing classified information. Despite repeated requests for individualized counseling or some other reasonable accommodation to allow Sergeant Somers to receive appropriate care for his PTSD, the VA delayed in its providing him with suitable support and care.

Like many veterans, Sergeant Somers' isolation got worse when he transitioned to civilian life. He tried to provide for his family, but he was unable to work due to his disability. He struggled with the VA bureaucracy. His disability appeal had been pending for more than 2 years without there having been any resolution, and he didn't get the help he needed in time.

On June 10 of 2013, Sergeant Somers wrote a letter to his family.

He wrote:

I am not getting better. I am not going to get better. And I will most certainly deteriorate further as time goes on.

He went on to write:

I am left with basically nothing. Too trapped in a war to be at peace. Too damaged to be at war. Abandoned by those who would take the easy route and a liability to those who stick it out and thus deserve better. So you see, not only am I better off dead, but the world is better without me in it. This is what brought me to my actual final mission.

On that day, we lost SGT Daniel Somers to suicide.

Americans who return home from having served our Nation must always have somewhere to turn for support. I am committed to ensuring that no veteran feels trapped like Sergeant Somers did and that all of our veterans have access to appropriate mental health care.

Sergeant Somers' story will sound too familiar to too many military families. Perhaps less common is the astonishing bravery that had been demonstrated by Sergeant Somers' parents, Howard and Jean, after their son's death.

Howard and Jean are in the Senate's Gallery today, and I am so honored to have them here as I share their son's story.

Howard and Jean were devastated by the loss of their son, and nobody would have blamed them if they had turned inward to deal with their grief, but they didn't. Howard and Jean faced the world and bravely shared SGT Daniel Somers' story, and they have created a mission of their own. Their mission is to ensure that Sergeant Somers' story brings to light America's deadliest war—the 20 veterans we lose to suicide in this country every day.

While I served in the U.S. House, I worked closely with Howard and Jean to develop and pass into law the Daniel Somers Classified Veterans Access to Care Act, which is legislation that ensures veterans who serve in a classified capacity receive behavioral health services in an appropriate care setting.

Now it is time to take the next innovative step in providing the support our servicemembers and veterans have

earned, for servicemembers' loved ones are not always aware of the resources that are available to them—resources that can prove to be critical when those servicemembers encounter challenges during Active Duty or after their separations from the military.

The Somers' family and I have worked over the past several months with the Department of Defense on new legislation to create a network of support for our military members. In May, I introduced the bipartisan Sergeant Daniel Somers Network of Support Act, which was cosponsored by my friend and colleague on the Veterans' Affairs Committee, Republican Senator THOM TILLIS. Our legislation requires each new servicemember be asked for the names of loved ones whom he or she considers to be part of his or her network of support. In return, the Department of Defense and the Red Cross will provide information about benefits and services that are available to military members.

By engaging loved ones and families from the beginning, the Department of Defense can better prepare and equip our military families and friends to better understand military life, to notice when servicemembers are in need, and to help ensure that servicemembers get the right kind of assistance or care. We must do everything possible to empower family and friends, who are the first line of defense in our preventing suicide amongst our veterans and servicemembers.

This commonsense solution could be a game-changer for the men and women who have risked their lives to protect our freedoms, for their isolation leads to tragedy. We have worked with Congressman SCOTT PETERS, of California, who has introduced companion legislation in the U.S. House. In working as a team across party lines, we successfully included our network of support legislation in the national defense bill that was passed by both the Senate and the House over the past few weeks.

I am proud of this accomplishment, but we have so much more to do. When servicemembers transition from active service to veteran status, they face old and confusing regulations that can be difficult to navigate even for those who are able to care for themselves. We must ensure that veterans who receive care from the VA also have a network of support in place to help them thrive and prosper when they return to civilian life. I have spoken directly with VA Secretary Robert Wilkie, who expressed his support for extending the network of support to veterans, and I look forward to working closely with him to get it done.

As we continue this work, I urge my colleagues to join me in expanding this critical program. We can help ensure together that all veterans have networks to turn to so they never have to face their challenges alone.

The story of Sergeant Somers and his parents, the failure of the VA bureauc-

racy to provide the support this Arizona veteran needed, and the resulting tragedy is not a story that dominated the national headlines. It is not a political scandal, and it is not a partisan food fight to which Members of Congress are pressured to respond. It is not what reporters in the Capitol's hallways ask me about, and it is not what people tweet to me on a daily or on even an hourly basis. You will never see a push notification on your iPhone about legislation like ours. Yet this is the kind of work that matters. It matters to Sergeant Somers' parents, and it matters to veterans across my State. It matters to military families and to loved ones, and it matters to Arizona. It is exactly why, as Arizona's senior Senator, I will not spend my time focusing on areas of disagreement, because expending energy on the latest tweet, on the latest insult, and on petty politics simply doesn't move the needle for everyday people like the Somers.

As a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I am fortunate to serve with Republican Chairman JOHNNY ISAKSON and Ranking Member JON TESTER—two Senators who demonstrate every day what can get done when leaders put aside their differences and work toward common goals. Our bipartisan legislation got this far thanks in part to support from Senators ISAKSON and TESTER, as well as from the leaders of the Armed Services Committee, Chairman JAMES INHOFE and Ranking Member JACK REED. However, in this effort and in so many others, I sorely miss the leadership of the former Armed Services chairman and my personal hero, John McCain.

So many of my colleagues in this body came to know and love Senator John McCain for his military heroism and for his years of leadership in the Senate. Back home in Arizona, Senator John McCain is also a hero for what he represented in public service.

What Senator McCain said in his last speech in this very Chamber shapes my service to Arizona every day. He said:

But make no mistake, my service here is the most important job I have had in my life. And I am so grateful to the people of Arizona for the privilege—for the honor—of serving here and the opportunities it gives me to play a small role in the history of the country I love.

He went on to say:

Merely preventing your political opponents from doing what they want isn't the most inspiring work. There's greater satisfaction in respecting our differences, but not letting them prevent agreements that don't require abandonment of core principles, agreements made in good faith that help improve lives and protect the American people. . . . What a great honor and extraordinary opportunity it is to serve in this body.

Senator McCain talked of what is possible when the Senate works the way it was meant to work. He stood for everything we stand for as Arizonans: fighting for what you believe in, standing up for what is right even if you stand alone, and serving a cause greater than one's self.

He taught us to always assume the best in others, to seek compromise instead of sowing division, and to always put country ahead of party.

One of Senator McCain's last acts in the Senate was to shepherd last year's annual Defense bill into law—the same annual bill which, this year, includes our Daniel Somers Network of Support Act. I hope we are making Senator McCain proud with such important work.

With Senator McCain's example lighting the way, and with the trust of the people of Arizona shaping my service, I recommit to ignoring political games and focusing on upholding Arizona values to get things done for the State and for the country I love.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BORDER SECURITY

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. President, I rise to address an issue that transcends politics and strikes at the very core of who we are as Americans.

Throughout my time in Congress, I have made it my priority to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, to look past partisanship, and to work toward passing commonsense legislation so we can help working families in Nevada and across our country.

In the House, I was proud to be named one of the most bipartisan Members of Congress, and that is a title I plan to keep in the Senate. So I hope my colleagues recognize the seriousness of why I rise today.

It is without partisan motivation when I say that we have a crisis on our hands. Make no mistake about it, there is a humanitarian crisis at our southern border and we are failing to address it. This administration is failing to address it. This Congress is failing to address it.

With violence and political unrest increasing in the Northern Triangle countries of El Salvador, Honduras, and Guatemala, we are experiencing a surge in the number of migrants who have come to our southern border seeking refuge from violence and persecution.

More than 60 percent of migrants are families and unaccompanied children fleeing for their lives and seeking a safe place. Children and their families are coming to our country for the same reasons so many of our ancestors did—because they have no other choice. They are coming to the United States, a nation of immigrants, a nation built on a foundation of core values, and we do not turn away those fleeing persecution and certain death.

It is those same values that tell us that when children—including infants

and toddlers—are at our doorstep, we do not put them in cages, tear them from their mother's arms, let them go without showers, food, or medical attention, or let them sleep on cold floors.

The reality is, Customs and Border Patrol officers are not trained to care for children, much less those who have experienced trauma. They are not prepared nor qualified to provide the much needed care to the families and children who are coming here.

What is also true is that there are members of our Border Patrol and law enforcement who are trying to do the right thing. Those men and women signed up to protect our country from terrorism, narcotics, and foreign threats. They are not trained to take care of traumatized children. The fact remains, the state of things in these immigration facilities is untenable and indefensible.

I have had the chance to see this crisis firsthand, so allow me to speak a little bit on what I have witnessed and how we got here.

Children and families have been placed into overcrowded and unsanitary facilities, left without suitable living conditions or even the most basic of necessities for days or even weeks.

Last year, while serving as a member of the House of Representatives, I traveled to the U.S.-Mexico border with one of my colleagues. We toured the Tornillo unaccompanied minor facility and the Paso del Norte Processing Center in Texas. What we witnessed there was heartbreaking.

We saw a tent city holding unaccompanied migrant children and children separated from their parents. They have no access to legal counsel, no way to regularly talk to their families. They are without any idea of what might happen next. Throughout their camp, there was a sense of anxiety, hopelessness, and despair. I have carried the images of what I saw during that tour with me to this day.

In committee testimony and in followup briefings, in conversations with the administration and its agencies, we were told conditions would improve, that plans were in place to provide the care that is so desperately needed, and that families would be reunited. We now know that was wrong.

We have all seen the news and read reports detailing the abysmal state of these facilities—children still in cages, still going to sleep hungry, still going weeks without bathing or having access to clean clothes, young children being tasked by officers to care for toddlers, and, in some cases, allegations of sexual abuse by officers.

To find out firsthand whether conditions are improving, just last week I joined my Senate colleagues in touring detention facilities in the McAllen, TX, area. I am sad to say these news reports are accurate. These horrific conditions have not changed, families are still being separated, children are still

in cages, not knowing if they will ever see their parents again, and this administration continues to ignore basic human rights. Children should never be held in these conditions under any circumstances, for any amount of time, period.

We saw children stuffed into crowded spaces. The people detained in these facilities lack access to basic necessities like toothpaste and access to sanitary supplies. There are few, if any, pediatricians, no child welfare professionals, no hope, just thousands of children and families in the care of law enforcement officers. This is not who we are.

The dehumanization of migrants, including many tender-age children in our detention centers today, is unacceptable. The psychological trauma they have experienced, and that they are continuing to experience, will likely leave children with deep scars that will haunt them for the rest of their lives.

Let me be clear: We are failing our law enforcement, we are failing our families, and we are failing children.

We can agree that immigrants with criminal records or those who have falsified their reasons for coming should not be allowed to stay, but during my visit to McAllen last week, the acting head of Border Patrol told all of us that the vast majority of migrant families are not criminals.

I refuse to stand by while this takes place on American soil. So I decided to take action by placing holds on two individuals nominated by this administration to serve in administrative and policy roles of DHS until conditions in these facilities drastically improve, until DHS meets the standards it is obligated—obligated—to uphold.

This is the United States of America. All children deserve to be treated humanely and with dignity, and those of any age who come to our country claiming asylum have a legal right to present their case.

We must ensure that we achieve, at the very least, minimum humanitarian standards at CBP facilities. That means all CBP facilities where children are processed or detained need to have onsite medical professionals with pediatric training and child welfare professionals. That means implementing a process for announced and unannounced site visits by NGOs so we can ensure proper oversight and accountability, as well as direct services for children. Even something as simple as a sign that communicates to migrant families explaining where they are and what to expect—something that simple could reduce anxiety and hopelessness that these individuals and children are feeling.

There is so much good in the American people, and that shows in the outpouring of support from NGOs that are ready and willing to step in and respond. They do so many other humanitarian efforts. Yet our government is

turning away these offers of help. Conditions at these facilities have not improved, and until they do, I will not remove my holds on this administration's nominees.

Once we have taken the necessary steps to ensure migrant children are being held in safe and sanitary conditions, we must then take up the critical and long-overdue task of reforming our long-term immigration policy. We owe it to migrant children and families to reach an immediate solution. We owe it to our law enforcement to prevent this difficult situation from continuing.

We must come together. We must take action now because, at the end of the day, these are human lives, and they depend on us.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VOTE ON STEPHEN M. DICKSON

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, in a few moments, at 12 noon, the Senate will vote on a cloture motion for the nomination of Stephen M. Dickson to be Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration. I rise in strong support of that motion. I think it will pass today. I will be supporting the nomination when it comes to a full vote on the floor of the Senate sometime later.

As chair of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, let me report that we recently voted to report Mr. Dickson's nomination favorably out of the committee. I hope the Senate will soon confirm this highly qualified nominee. Steve Dickson was chosen for this important position based on his strong qualifications, which include almost 40 years of combined service in the U.S. Air Force and the commercial air transportation sector.

Mr. Dickson is a 1979 distinguished graduate of the Air Force Academy and graduated magna cum laude from Georgia State University College of Law in 1999, where he earned his J.D. He served in the U.S. Air Force as an F-15 fighter pilot, including assignments as a flight commander, instructor pilot, and flight examiner. From 1991 until October of 2018, Mr. Dickson was employed by Delta Air Lines as a pilot and management executive. He retired after rising through the ranks to become Delta's senior vice president of flight operations.

On May 15, the committee held a hearing to consider Mr. Dickson's nomination, and he clearly demonstrated the experience and leadership abilities necessary to lead the FAA. I don't know if there was a single member of the committee who failed to be impressed.

After Mr. Dickson's hearing, new information came to the committee's at-

tention, which we gave due diligence to looking into. The information involved employees reporting possible safety violations at Mr. Dickson's former employer while he was serving as senior vice president. These matters merited further examination. The committee conducted an extensive review of these allegations, including multiple followup conversations and meetings with Mr. Dickson. We have studied hundreds of pages of legal documents.

Here is what we know for a fact about these allegations. We know for a fact—and it is uncontroverted—that Mr. Dickson was not a named party in any of these matters. We also know for a fact that he was not personally alleged to have retaliated against any of his fellow employees who raised the safety concerns.

Mr. Dickson's responses to post-hearing questions for the record demonstrate that he has commitments to safety and to the protection of employees who report concerns and that that is paramount, in his view. In fact, Mr. Dickson unequivocally stated in his written responses that he was never named as a party to any judicial, administrative, or regulatory proceedings and was never accused of retaliation of any sort during his tenure at his former employer.

I think the FAA, we all agree, should be the gold standard in aviation safety. I think Steve Dickson is the correct person to be confirmed and sit at the helm of the FAA at this crucial time for the agency. The majority of the committee believes that Mr. Dickson is an excellent nominee for this position and will bring the commitment, experience, and expertise necessary to lead the FAA and fulfill its mission. I am going to be urging my colleagues to vote yes on the cloture motion and then to swiftly confirm Mr. Dickson's nomination.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I complete my remarks before we move to the vote to confirm our next Secretary of Defense.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF MARK T. ESPER

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, we are in a great position that we are not very often in. We have someone who is enthusiastically supported by Republicans, by Democrats, and he is obviously the right person. He has the trust of our President, he has the trust of our military, and he has the trust of Congress and the country to keep our Nation safe.

Dr. Mark Esper is the right man for the job. He is a great choice to lead the Pentagon, and I am proud to support him. And I am not the only one. In fact, I would like to take a moment to share some of the bipartisan support we have for Dr. Esper from the defense experts, former officials, and my own colleagues.

Senator KAINE from Virginia said this at Dr. Esper's confirmation hearing:

He is a person of sound character and moral courage. He's been proactive and transparent . . . trademarks of exceptional leadership.

Secretary Mattis—you remember him—when Dr. Esper was being sworn in as the Secretary of the Army, then-Secretary of Defense Mattis said:

The bottom line is the virtuous and vile alike have written history, but let's remember here today that we're the good guys . . . and this is the man who can take us forward.

Mark Jacobson, a senior adviser to Ash Carter, said:

This is someone who can work across the aisle. This is somebody who can work with Congress. And that's really what defines him. A soldier, a scholar.

The Senate majority leader, MITCH MCCONNELL, said:

Anybody impartial would have to have come away impressed by Dr. Esper's mastery, intelligence, and thoroughness.

My colleagues in the Armed Services Committee also widely support Dr. Esper's nomination, advancing his nomination with an overwhelming bipartisan vote.

Across the Capitol, both the chairman and ranking member of the House Armed Services Committee support Dr. Esper. They all support him. Chairman ADAM SMITH said that Dr. Esper is "capable of executing the National Defense Strategy in a way that is insulated from outside influence and political considerations. . . . The Department would benefit from his leadership." That is my counterpart over in the House.

Ranking Member MAC THORNBERRY said he has "done an outstanding job as Secretary of the Army." I agree with Congressman THORNBERRY.

Under Dr. Esper's leadership, we saw Army modernization leap forward by leaps and bounds. He managed the largest reorganization of the Army in 45 years, prioritizing research, development, and innovation. He showed accountability to the taxpayers by being responsible with his budget, making tough decisions, tough choices, streamlining legacy programs, and directing defense dollars to critical future needs.

It is impressive, but being a good Army Secretary isn't enough on its own. Secretary Mattis reminded us that civilian leaders in our military must be more than their past accomplishments. Mark Esper is more because he truly respects and honors his commitment to the men and women in uniform. I have seen this firsthand.

Back in April, I asked Dr. Esper to join me on a visit to Fort Sill in my State of Oklahoma. What impressed me was how well he communicated with the troops in the field. He is one of the troops out there, and you could see the love that he had for them. In Fort Sill, he even joined them—and I was there—for an Army combat fitness test workout. He participated with the troops. He ate the MREs out in the field. Anyone who has been in the Army can tell

you that you don't often find people who choose to do that, but Mark Esper did.

Dr. Esper deeply cares about the troops, whether it is making sure that they have the weapons, equipment, and training they need to succeed in their missions or simply that they have quality housing when they are on base.

We moved quickly to consider Dr. Esper's nomination here on the floor, but that isn't because we didn't fulfill our duty of advice and consent. We did. Dr. Esper testified for over 3 hours. Between his hearing and his followup questions for the record, he answered approximately 600 questions. It is clear that Dr. Esper has what it takes to lead the Department of Defense and that most of my colleagues think so as well.

He has served the Nation with honor and integrity, and I am certain that he is going to continue to do so when he is confirmed.

I strongly request a strong vote to confirm Dr. Mark Esper to be our next Secretary of Defense.

With that, I yield the floor.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRUZ). Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Mark T. Esper, of Virginia, to be Secretary of Defense.

VOTE ON ESPER NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Esper nomination?

Mr. WICKER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) would have voted "yea".

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 90, nays 8, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 220 Ex.]

YEAS—90

Alexander	Blackburn	Braun
Baldwin	Blumenthal	Brown
Barrasso	Blunt	Burr
Bennet	Boozman	Cantwell

Capito	Hirono	Roberts
Cardin	Hoeben	Romney
Carper	Hyde-Smith	Rosen
Casey	Inhofe	Rounds
Cassidy	Johnson	Rubio
Collins	Jones	Sasse
Coons	Kaine	Schatz
Cornyn	Kennedy	Schumer
Cortez Masto	King	Scott (FL)
Cotton	Lankford	Scott (SC)
Cramer	Leahy	Shaheen
Crapo	Lee	Shelby
Cruz	Manchin	Sinema
Daines	McConnell	Smith
Duckworth	McSally	Stabenow
Durbin	Menendez	Sullivan
Enzi	Moran	Tester
Ernst	Murkowski	Thune
Feinstein	Murphy	Tillis
Fischer	Murray	Toomey
Gardner	Paul	Udall
Graham	Perdue	Van Hollen
Grassley	Peters	Warner
Hassan	Portman	Whitehouse
Hawley	Reed	Wicker
Heinrich	Risch	Young

NAYS—8

Booker	Klobuchar	Warren
Gillibrand	Markey	Wyden
Harris	Merkley	

NOT VOTING—2

Isakson	Sanders
---------	---------

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table.

The President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on nomination of Stephen M. Dickson, of Georgia, to be Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration for the term of five years.

James M. Inhofe, John Hoeven, Mike Rounds, Joni Ernst, Kevin Cramer, Pat Roberts, John Boozman, Mike Crapo, Steve Daines, John Cornyn, James E. Risch, Roger F. Wicker, Richard Burr, Thom Tillis, Roy Blunt, Shelley Moore Capito, Mitch McConnell.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Stephen M. Dickson, of Georgia, to be Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration for the term of five years, shall be brought to a close? The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS)

and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 52, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 221 Ex.]

YEAS—52

Alexander	Fischer	Portman
Barrasso	Gardner	Risch
Blackburn	Graham	Roberts
Blunt	Grassley	Romney
Boozman	Hawley	Rounds
Braun	Hoeben	Rubio
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Capito	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Collins	Kennedy	Shelby
Cornyn	Lankford	Sullivan
Cotton	Lee	Thune
Cramer	McConnell	Tillis
Crapo	McSally	Toomey
Cruz	Moran	Wicker
Daines	Murkowski	Young
Enzi	Paul	
Ernst	Perdue	

NAYS—45

Baldwin	Harris	Peters
Bennet	Hassan	Reed
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Rosen
Booker	Hirono	Schatz
Brown	Jones	Schumer
Cantwell	Kaine	Shaheen
Cardin	King	Sinema
Carper	Klobuchar	Smith
Casey	Leahy	Stabenow
Coons	Manchin	Tester
Cortez Masto	Markey	Udall
Duckworth	Menendez	Van Hollen
Durbin	Merkley	Warner
Feinstein	Murphy	Warren
Gillibrand	Murray	Wyden

NOT VOTING—3

Isakson	Sanders	Whitehouse
---------	---------	------------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 52, the nays are 45.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Stephen M. Dickson, of Georgia, to be Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration for the term of five years.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislative session.

The Senator from Maine.

RECESS

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until 2 p.m. for the weekly conference meetings.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 1:04 p.m., recessed until 2 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mrs. CAPITO).

NEVER FORGET THE HEROES: JAMES ZADROGA, RAY PFEIFER, AND LUIS ALVAREZ PERMANENT AUTHORIZATION OF THE SEPTEMBER 11TH VICTIM COMPENSATION FUND ACT—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. GARDNER. Madam President, this afternoon the Senate will vote on permanent reauthorization of the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund. I am proud to lead this legislation with Senator GILLIBRAND, and I thank all of the incredible first responders for their efforts to make this day happen and, day in and day out, to get this legislation to where it is today.

This critical legislation would fully fund the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund and ensure that all those exposed to toxins and impacted by 9/11-related illnesses are thoroughly compensated, both now and as conditions are diagnosed in the future.

Solving this problem is urgent as more and more people become sick—people like Luis Alvarez, who came to Washington, DC, just a few months ago, postponing chemotherapy treatment to advocate for his fellow heroes. Luis is not here to watch from the Gallery today. He is watching from above.

As we celebrate this vote today, we celebrate the lives of people like Luis Alvarez.

The Never Forget the Heroes: James Zadroga, Ray Pfeifer, and Luis Alvarez Permanent Authorization of the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund Act is named in honor of these three first responders who lost their lives to 9/11-related illnesses. Today, the Senate has an opportunity to honor these three and so many others we have lost who never stopped fighting for 9/11 first responders and the country they loved by voting yes on this critical legislation.

I have shared with many of my colleagues that I never had the privilege of going to New York City before September 11, 2001, but I will never forget my first visit after September 11, 2001. It was just a few weeks after the attack had happened. I will never forget the smell. I will never forget the smoke coming out of the debris piles. I will never forget the silent firetrucks—their lights on but no siren—as they delivered even more heroes to the recovery efforts at Ground Zero. I will never forget the fierce dedication of the men and women who came when they were called, watching the firetrucks with their flags heading to continue the work that by then had become so emblazoned in people's minds across this country.

The work they did in those days, those weeks, and those months wasn't just for those in Manhattan who suffered an incredible loss. The work they carried forward for our country became symbols of our security, symbols of our freedoms, symbols of this country's willingness, determination, effort, and tenacity to fight back.

Law enforcement officers and firefighters from across the Nation, including the West Metro Fire Rescue in Colorado, home of Colorado Task Force 1, have been tireless advocates for this effort. Every State has people who served in one capacity or another during the rescue and recovery operations of September 11.

West Metro Fire District chief Steve Aseltine was one of 64 Coloradans with Colorado Task Force 1 who participated, as he said, searching through the rubble piles. Steve said: No one should be at risk of standing up and worrying, when this country needs them the most, whether the American Government has their back.

If passed today, without amendments, the legislation will head straight to the President's desk for his signature. So I urge my colleagues today not to forget, to pass a clean bill, and to join me in opposing both amendments, and to stand with all of our first responders and heroes from that tragic day for this bill's final passage and ultimate enactment.

I urge this Chamber to support those who have given so much to this country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Madam President, today I will offer an amendment to pay for the spending in this bill. This is not something unusual. I do this day in and day out. It has been part of the reason I ran for office—that we shouldn't add more debt to our country without trying to pay for it by maybe reducing spending from wasteful spending.

In the last week or so, we have seen a manufactured crisis. Rarely has there been a manufactured crisis so intense—a fake furor instigated by partisans more concerned with scoring points than telling the truth. But, for some of us, the truth is still important.

The mob and demagogues in this body accuse me of holding up this bill for political points. They obviously don't know much about politics, because there certainly hasn't been any political gain by my holding this bill for debate and amendment. But I think it is important we do this, rather than rush through and everybody says: No questions asked, please. It sounds a little more like an authoritarian atmosphere than it would be a democracy, to actually have debate, discussion, and amendments. That is all we have asked for.

In fact, last week when we were granted the amendments, we said to the other side: Let's have the vote—last week. And all of those who were in such a furor, all those who were so hysterical that the world was ending said: Oh, we cannot vote on it—it was not convenient last week—because some of our Democrat Members have already gone home for the weekend. So when the mob was told last week they could have the vote, they said no. It is a manufactured crisis. As of today, the

fund in question has \$2 billion in it, and no one is being denied medical care.

So let's have an honest debate. Let's have an honest debate about whether it matters to this country whether we are \$2 billion in debt, and whether or not, when we have new spending programs—no matter how charitable, no matter how needed—whether or not we are going to pay for them by reducing spending in wasteful programs.

It is perhaps a historical anomaly that this bill appropriates unlimited funds for a virtually unlimited time period.

What would you think if someone came to you, they had a good cause, and they said: You know, my neighbors' house has burnt down, and I want to help them, and I want to give them unlimited money for an unlimited period of time?

That wouldn't be wise. No one would do that. So why do we, in our hysteria, throw out all common sense and say that we are going to approach this as if we don't have a problem?

We have this enormous problem in our country. We are borrowing over \$1 million a minute. My amendment today is to offer to pay for the \$10 billion in the first 10 years. Realize that this bill as written is not a 10-year bill. It is a 72-year bill. It goes to the year 2092. To my knowledge, we have never, ever had a bill that was unlimited in the dollar amount and unlimited in the time period. Mine would be to pay for the first 10 years of this. The pay would come by reducing mandatory spending by 0.06 percent. That is 6/100th of 1 percent of other mandatory spending.

At the same time, we would exempt Medicare, Social Security, and Veterans Affairs from cuts. We would exempt the vast bulk of mandatory spending, but we would still say: If this is a wise expenditure of money, if we need more money for this fund, we would simply take it from something that is less pressing.

No matter how good a cause may be, it makes no sense to borrow from China to pay for our immediate concerns. Spending someone else's money is not charity. Spending borrowed money is just not wise or sound governance.

Being a legislator should be about making choices, about deciding priorities.

For example, which is more important—spending \$275 million teaching foreign countries how to apply for U.S. foreign aid and teaching foreign countries how to get our money and how to fill out the grant process? Is that more important than the spending in this bill? We will never know because the people who promote this bill aren't willing to cut any spending. They are not going to look at waste.

We wonder why we have waste run from top to bottom in our government? Because no one is willing, even for a good cause, to say: Why don't we cut out some of this waste? Why don't we

quit spending money teaching foreigners how to apply to get more of our money?

To pay for more pressing concerns, shouldn't someone ask whether it is wise to spend \$300,000 studying whether Japanese quail are more sexually promiscuous on cocaine? That is your money. So when somebody is being asked for a good cause, ask why we couldn't eliminate money we are spending on awful things that should never have been wasted in the Federal Government.

To pay for more pressing concerns, shouldn't someone ask why we continue to spend \$50 billion a year building bridges and roads and hotels and gas stations in Afghanistan? Perhaps that money could be better spent here at home.

The debate today is not over the spending of the money. It is over, when we do spend money—even for a good cause—whether or not we should cut corresponding money that we are wasting around the world, much of it not helping American citizens and much of it going to foreign countries and foreign people.

To pay for more pressing concerns, shouldn't someone ask why we had a study last year that spent \$2 million seeking to know the question: If someone in front of you in the cafeteria line sneezes on the food, are you more or less likely to pick up the food and eat it?

Seriously, this is where your tax dollars are going. If we have a better cause, and we want to fund this fund we are talking about today, couldn't we say we will not spend \$2 million next year studying whether, if someone sneezes on your food, you are more or less likely to take the food?

Shouldn't we be forced as a Congress to make decisions, instead of just saying: Well, it is a good cause. So, therefore, we should not use our brain. We should put on blinders. We shouldn't think about it, and we should just say: Well, it is a good cause so let's just borrow the money from China.

Do you think that helps us as a country? Isn't part of legislating trying to prioritize spending, not just adding to the debt?

The leftwing mob maintains that Republicans have lost the moral high ground and can't talk about debt anymore because we supported a tax cut. Poppycock. This is misinformation. This is fake news. This is plainly people just not paying any attention to what goes on around here.

During the tax cut, which I supported, I offered cuts to mandatory spending to pay for the tax cut. The media seems to have forgotten this. But I forced a vote on the floor to say: Yes, we may be cutting taxes and, if it affects the deficit, we should pay for it.

Interestingly, though, the leftwing mob doesn't want to admit that when we actually cut tax rates, we actually got more money. The revenue coming in last year was actually greater than

the previous year. The tax cut didn't add to the deficit. The deficit went up because we continue to spend money and we actually added more spending. The curve of spending increases actually rose faster than the revenue coming in.

When the tax cut happened, I offered an amendment to cut spending to pay for it. This is a fact. The leftwing mob and all of their buddies in the media can do and say whatever they want. It is a free country, but it is an absolute out-and-out lie that Republicans who voted for this tax cut also were not concerned with spending. I, for one was, and I offered an amendment to cut spending.

The tax cut also was passed under a law we have had on the books for some time. It is called the pay-go law. This is a law that should be working even on a bill like this current bill. But we exempt ourselves from it all the time. The current bill actually exempts the pay-go rules: If you increase spending by \$10 billion, you have to decrease it by \$10 billion somewhere else.

It has been on the books for a long time, but like everything else Congress does, they try to bring in rules to say: Do you know what? We are going to try to control the debt and spending by forcing ourselves, when we come up with some new spending of \$10 billion, that we will have to come up with something to cut to pay for it.

What happens is, Congress just waives the rules. It is not that we don't have rules that should help with the budget; we have hundreds of rules. The pay-go rule is a good rule, but it gets ignored. We passed the tax cut. If the projections were that the deficit was going to go up, guess what, the pay-go rules would say there has to be automatic spending cuts across the board. This is something I support.

So what happened? About a month after the tax cut, a big spending bill comes through here. Both parties are guilty, Republicans and Democrats. They love to spend money more than anything else. A big spending bill comes through, and guess what. They waive the rule on pay-go.

At that time, I also brought up an amendment that said: Hey, you guys shouldn't waive the pay-go rule. If the tax cut causes the debt to go up, we should cut spending across board.

Let's be very clear around here. There are those of us who have been consistent from day one that the debt does matter. There is no particular animus toward this bill. In the last year, I have done this probably a half dozen times. In the last 2 years, I have probably done it two dozen times. That means every spending bill.

A month ago, it was spending for the border. I support money to be spent on the border, but I don't support doing it if it adds to the deficit.

The amendment I have today is identical to the amendment I had a month ago, saying: Border spending, even if you want to do it, we should cut money

from somewhere else where it is not as much needed and where it is being wasted.

I did it 3 months ago for the hurricane disaster relief. Every bit of new spending—it doesn't matter whether it is a good cause, bad cause, or an in-between cause, we need to not keep adding to the debt. This is a problem. We borrow over \$1 million—close to \$2 million every minute. This is a problem for our country. We are eroding the foundation of this country with so much debt—\$22 trillion in debt.

The tax cut was passed under the pay-go rules. I voted not to suspend the pay-go rules. I voted to actually have spending cuts to offset any increase in the deficit from the tax cut.

The establishment of both parties moved to waive this pay-go requirement. I forced a vote, and only eight Senators voted, which shows you where the real problem is. Why does the deficit go up so much? There is not one Democrat in Congress who cares a flip about the deficit. Not one Democrat in Congress will lift a finger to refrain from government spending. Therefore, everything—you name it, they are for it.

The problem is, Republicans aren't so good on this either. There are only a handful of Republicans who actually care about the debt, and many of them will vote consistently to raise the debt limit and vote to add new debt.

Today's vote, though, is but a prelude of next week's vote. This is the preliminary. This is the introduction to our problem in our country, over \$10 billion. Next week, it is the enormity of the entire budget. Next week, both parties—and watch this closely. People say: Oh, Republicans can't get along with Democrats. Guess what. They get along just swell when it comes to spending money and adding to the debt.

This bill will pass overwhelmingly today without any concern for the debt or paying for it. Next week will be even worse. We have something called the debt ceiling. Every time we spend more money that comes in, in taxes, it approaches a debt ceiling, and the debt ceiling says you can't borrow any more money. So conservatives say: Well, we should reform our ways and quit giving away money to Afghanistan and Mexico and all these different countries. We should have reform involved with raising the debt ceiling.

What is going to come about next week is no debt ceiling for 2 years, until after the next Presidential election. It is a terrible idea. It is fiscal insanity. They also will vote to forever get rid of the sequester caps.

In 2011, amongst the tea party movement, when more people became concerned about the deficit spending, we actually came in and had a reform. For the first time, we didn't cut spending; we slowed down the rate of growth of spending. In doing so, the deficit was narrowing. For a couple of years, we were doing better. Then what happened

was basically both parties once again came together. The Republicans said: We want to be in every war overseas we can possibly get involved in, and we want to have more money spent on the military.

The liberals said: We need more money for welfare.

Guess what. They are not at odds. You scratch my back; I will scratch yours.

The Republicans and Democrats agree on one thing: Spending money is the most important thing they can do. The deficit doesn't matter.

So when we come back, when we address this issue next week, what we are going to find is they are going to explode the debt ceiling. There will be no limits on the debt ceiling for 2 years, and they are getting rid of all pretense of having any spending caps.

A majority of Republicans, unfortunately, will even vote to get rid of the budget caps and to eliminate the debt ceiling for 2 years. This is sad.

Today, though, the Senate has a chance to vote to pay for this \$10 billion bill with very modest reductions in mandatory spending—reductions that actually exempt Medicare, Social Security, and Veterans Affairs.

Americans, particularly conservatives, need to sit up and watch closely how their Senators vote, for today's vote is about whether your representative really cares at all about the disaster that is our \$22 trillion debt.

AMENDMENT NO. 929

Madam President, I call up my amendment No. 929 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. PAUL] proposes an amendment numbered 929.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To require a sequestration of certain direct spending)

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 5. SEQUESTRATION.

(A) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—
(1) the terms “direct spending” and “sequestration” have the meanings given such terms in section 250(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900(c)); and

(2) the term “nonexempt direct spending” means all direct spending except—

(A) direct spending for benefits payable under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program established under title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.);

(B) direct spending for the Medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.);

(C) direct spending for net interest (all of major functional category 900);

(D) direct spending for any program administered by the Department of Veterans Affairs;

(E) direct spending for Special Benefits for Certain World War II Veterans (28-0401-0-1-701); and

(F) direct spending for the child nutrition program (as defined in section 25(b) of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1769f(b)).

(b) SEQUESTRATION ORDERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For fiscal year 2020, as soon as is practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, and on the dates the Office of Management and Budget issues its sequestration preview reports for each of fiscal years 2021 through 2025, pursuant to section 254(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 904(c)), the President shall order a sequestration, effective upon issuance, that reduces all non-exempt direct spending by the uniform percentage necessary to reduce the total amount of nonexempt direct spending for such fiscal year by \$2,036,000,000.

(2) IMPLEMENTATION.—When implementing the sequestration of nonexempt direct spending under paragraph (1), the Office of Management and Budget—

(A) shall follow the procedures specified in section 6 of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (2 U.S.C. 935) and the special rules specified in section 256 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 906); and

(B) shall not follow the exemptions specified in section 255 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 905).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I am speaking on the bill as well as the amendments. In a short time, the Senate will vote on and pass a permanent reauthorization of the 9/11 Victim Compensation Fund.

In my short time on the floor, I can't do justice to the years upon years of work by the first responders, by labor leaders, by advocates that led to this moment. Suffice it to say, this is not a day of joy for them or for this bill's authors; rather, it is a day of relief.

For 18 years, those first responders, some of whom are in the Gallery, have watched their brothers and sisters get sick because they rushed bravely to the Towers at Ground Zero. At first, they were told by the government the air was safe.

It was not safe. We began hearing of cancers that people never got when they were 38 or 40 or 42 occurring all of a sudden in firefighters, in police officers, and they only had one thing in common: They had all rushed to the Towers.

They had to persuade people this was real because they saw their brothers and sisters dying. Then, they endured folks telling them they were crazy for thinking they had sicknesses they suffered that had anything to do with 9/11.

They were not crazy, and the people who told them they were, shame on them, including government agencies and others. Then, once it was confirmed beyond a shadow of a doubt that these cancers and respiratory illnesses were linked to the toxic dust and ash around the pile, it became an exhausting struggle to get Congress to provide the care they needed but they couldn't afford.

There were numerous false dawns and delays, temporary reauthorizations. We were forced to wait and wait, “compromise” with people's lives. Excuse after excuse. Some Senators voted proudly for tax cuts, unpaid for, to the

wealthiest of Americans but demanded offsets for these folks who had served us, like our soldiers have served us, like our armed services.

Thank God those excuses, those delays end today for good, and our first responders can go home and do what they want to do—tend to their own health, their families' health, the health of their brothers and sisters who were suffering and ailing, and tend to the families who have lost loved ones but are still part of their families.

The 9/11 health program is already permanent. Soon we will make the Victim Compensation Fund virtually permanent as well, and the twilight struggle of nearly two decades to get these brave men and women what they deserve will be, hopefully and finally, complete.

Once we defeat the few amendments before us—amendments that will delay the bill further, if not kill it—we should pass this bill overwhelmingly so we can send the first responders—those here and everywhere—home where they belong, with their family and their friends.

These are the same soldiers of valor who have selflessly risked their lives in our wars and conflicts overseas. There was a war right in the city I love, and these were our bravest soldiers. They rushed to the Towers. Maybe some people were alive. Maybe there were people who could be saved. We didn't know that then. We saw families holding signs: Have you seen my sister Mary? Have you seen my son Jim? These people rushed to the Towers to see if the Jim or Mary or the others were alive and didn't ask about themselves.

Now we are asking America to stand by them, every American, every Senator—Democrat, Republican, liberal, conservative—that shouldn't matter on an issue like this.

We are now at the very end of a long struggle. The struggle may end for the people in this Chamber, including those of us, like Senator GILLIBRAND and myself, who worked so hard through the years for this legislation. The struggle does not end for those who are sick or who may get sick and for their families. At least we are giving them some degree of help because they gave us so much help on that horrible day, 9/11, and those that ensued just afterward.

Let's pass this bill once and for all. Let's do our duty to them, to America, and to our ideals.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Madam President, I rise to join my colleagues in speaking about our 9/11 heroes. I thank Senator SCHUMER for his extraordinary leadership, his unwavering support, his dedication to taking this across the finish line, and his unbelievable willingness to lift up the voices of people who were not being listened to. Thank you to Senator SCHUMER.

I want to first note that while we are debating this bill, there is a wake happening on Staten Island right now for

Detective Christopher Cranston. A father of 5, he was only 48 years old, but he will be buried on Thursday because of the months of work he did on the pile at Ground Zero at Fresh Kills Landfill. He spent his 20th anniversary just a few weeks ago in chemotherapy.

The eyes of the Nation are looking at this Chamber today to see if we finally will stand by our 9/11 heroes for the rest of their lives. In a few minutes, heroes such as James Zadroga, Ray Pfeifer, and Lou Alvarez will have their names etched into the history books forever, which is where they belong.

Their families are in the Gallery today—here again, walking the halls of this Chamber and this Congress to be heard, here again to ask one more time that this body do what is right: to stand by them in their gravest time of need. Their families are here today to watch whether this Chamber will do what is right. They are standing here with so many others in the 9/11 community who have fought so hard to demand that Congress do the right thing.

Let's honor their service today. Let's actually honor their commitment to coming here time and time again, not for themselves but for their brothers and sisters who are sick, who are still dying all across this country. Seven are dying a week. Let's honor the ultimate sacrifice they paid for responding to the call of duty when the Nation needed them most. Responders came from every State across this country.

Last week, we lost Richard Driscoll, the 200th FDNY firefighter to succumb to a 9/11 illness. More police officers have died since 9/11 than on 9/11. More than 10,000 people have been certified with a 9/11-related cancer, with more being diagnosed every day. More will get sick. More will die. Some of them will not be diagnosed for years. That includes responders, and it includes the residents, teachers, and students who stayed downtown because the government told them the air was safe. They told them it was safe to breathe, even though it was not.

This bill will not change any of that, but we can finally let the people in the Gallery, who are sitting here watching us today and witnessing this, go home knowing that the government will truly never forget. We owe them that promise. Today, we have the opportunity to let them get back to their lives, to be with their families, and to exhale. They at least deserve that.

I thank Senator GARDNER for his leadership on this bill. I thank Senator MCCONNELL for staying true to his commitment. As I said earlier, I thank Senator SCHUMER for being a tremendous advocate, leader, and partner who never, ever, gave up. And I thank every single person who has spent their time and energy coming here again and again over these many years to advocate for this bill and for their brothers and sisters.

I ask every Senator to have empathy—just that bit of care for someone else—to vote yes on this bill and stand

by our first responders. I also urge every colleague of mine to reject the amendments that are being put forward.

First is the amendment from my colleague from Utah. Unfortunately, this amendment would accomplish only one thing. It would make these first responders have to go through this entire process again in just a few years. It would force sick and dying police officers, firefighters, and other 9/11 first responders to waste even more of their precious time coming here, away from their families, away from their loved ones, away from their cancer treatments, away from their last moments in their homes and communities, traveling back and forth to Washington and lobbying Congress to pass the bill for the fourth time. Do not fall into this trap.

Our 9/11 heroes deserve this program as it is written in the bill, without these amendments, which will only force them to have to come back here again and again. Stand up for our heroes. End the games. Let's reject this amendment, pass the bill, and let our heroes go home and live in peace, where they can breathe and finally exhale.

I yield the floor to my colleague from Utah.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is expired.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to deliver my remarks and delay the onset of the votes until after my remarks have been completed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, for many years, the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund has compensated the brave men and women who responded to the horrific events of 9/11. It has been a worthy use of money.

Of the \$7.4 billion authorized for the fund since 2011, however, \$25.4 billion has already been paid out. Since February of this year, money has gotten tight and claimants' benefits have had to be reduced. I believe it is only right for Congress to authorize and replenish the fund so that we can make those beneficiaries whole.

But the bill before us today has a peculiar feature, one that I believe requires our attention. The bill authorizes the program for 72 years and does not specify a dollar amount. If you look to page 2 of the bill, lines 8 through 10, it makes clear that this program is funded through 2092 and funded to the tune of "such sums as may be necessary." In other words, without any finite authorization, it offers no way to ensure that the money actually gets to its intended beneficiaries and is not lost in government bureaucracy or misuse.

That is, in fact, how we make sure that government programs get to where they need to go, by specifying not only the purpose of the fund but

also identifying how much it is that we are spending.

In 2011, the 9/11 Victim Compensation Fund has always had finite authorizations, and it has always had an absolutely excellent, outstanding record of avoiding waste, fraud, and abuse. The 9/11 survivors and responders deserve no less going forward.

That is why I am offering a simple amendment to this bill, one that would authorize \$10.2 billion in additional funding for the 9/11 Victim Compensation Fund over the next 10 years. To be clear, that is the full amount that the Congressional Budget Office has estimated is necessary for covering all claims through 2029.

My amendment wouldn't end there. It would go further to authorize an additional \$10 billion to be paid out in subsequent decades. It will not block or delay this bill's consideration, let alone its passage, nor does it have as its intended effect any kind of downgrading of the benefits we would be paying. But it would make sure that the money gets to the victims and the first responders who need it most—to the intended beneficiaries—rather than remaining vulnerable to the kinds of waste, fraud, and abuse that come about whenever we authorize something until 2092 with "such sums" language. This isn't the way we normally do things.

My distinguished colleague and friend from New York has made the comment that if this amendment were to pass, it would somehow make the victims of 9/11 come back again and again and go through this process over and over again. I don't see that. Those facts are not borne out by the record, which, again, indicates that the Congressional Budget Office itself has acknowledged that the amount of money I would be setting aside would be sufficient to fund this program.

This is how we make government programs work: We fund things for a period of time and for an amount of money that we believe is sufficient. This would do that. For that reason, I am proposing this amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 928

I, therefore, call up my amendment No. 928 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Utah [Mr. LEE] proposes an amendment numbered 928.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To limit the amount available for the Victims Compensation Fund)

Strike paragraph (1) of section 2(a) and insert the following:

(1) in subsection (c), by striking "\$4,600,000,000" and all that follows through "expended" and inserting "\$10,180,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2019 through 2029, and \$10,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2030 through 2092, to remain available until expended"; and

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 928

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is on

agreeing to the underlying amendment No. 928.

Mr. LEE. I ask for the yeas and nays. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll. The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. BLACKBURN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 66, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 222 Leg.]

YEAS—32

Barrasso	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Blackburn	Inhofe	Sasse
Blunt	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Braun	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cassidy	Lankford	Shelby
Crapo	Lee	Sullivan
Cruz	Paul	Tillis
Daines	Perdue	Toomey
Enzi	Risch	Wicker
Fischer	Romney	Young
Grassley	Rounds	

NAYS—66

Alexander	Gardner	Murphy
Baldwin	Gillibrand	Murray
Bennet	Graham	Peters
Blumenthal	Harris	Portman
Booker	Hassan	Reed
Boozman	Hawley	Roberts
Brown	Heinrich	Rosen
Cantwell	Hirono	Sanders
Capito	Hoeven	Schatz
Cardin	Jones	Schumer
Carper	Kaine	Shaheen
Casey	King	Sinema
Collins	Klobuchar	Smith
Coons	Leahy	Stabenow
Cornyn	Manchin	Tester
Cortez Masto	Markey	Thune
Cotton	McConnell	Udall
Cramer	McSally	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Menendez	Warner
Durbin	Merkley	Warren
Ernst	Moran	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murkowski	Wyden

NOT VOTING—2

Burr Isakson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 32 and the nays are 66.

Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of the amendment, the amendment is not agreed to.

The amendment (No. 928) was rejected.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 929

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question occurs on amendment No. 929 offered by the Senator from Kentucky, Mr. PAUL.

The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I would ask unanimous consent that the next two votes be 10 minutes in length.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered. The question is on agreeing to the Paul amendment.

Mr. GARDNER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll. The senior assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 22, nays 77, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 223 Leg.]

YEAS—22

Barrasso	Grassley	Romney
Blackburn	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Braun	Inhofe	Scott (SC)
Cassidy	Kennedy	Thune
Crapo	Lankford	Toomey
Cruz	Lee	Wicker
Daines	Paul	
Enzi	Risch	

NAYS—77

Alexander	Gillibrand	Portman
Baldwin	Graham	Reed
Bennet	Harris	Roberts
Blumenthal	Hassan	Rosen
Blunt	Hawley	Rounds
Booker	Heinrich	Rubio
Boozman	Hirono	Sanders
Brown	Hoeven	Schatz
Burr	Johnson	Schumer
Cantwell	Jones	Scott (FL)
Capito	Kaine	Scott (SC)
Cardin	King	Shaheen
Carper	Klobuchar	Shelby
Casey	Leahy	Sinema
Collins	Manchin	Smith
Coons	Markey	Stabenow
Cornyn	McConnell	Sullivan
Cortez Masto	McSally	Tester
Cotton	Menendez	Tillis
Cramer	Merkley	Udall
Duckworth	Moran	Van Hollen
Durbin	Murkowski	Warner
Ernst	Murphy	Warren
Feinstein	Murray	Whitehouse
Fischer	Perdue	Wyden
Gardner	Peters	Young

NOT VOTING—1

Isakson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 22, the nays are 77.

Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is not agreed to.

The amendment (No. 929) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Madam President, after this vote, the people in the Gallery above us, these brave men and women who have suffered unbelievably, will not have to come here again.

This should never have been a fight. It should never have taken this long to pass this bill and make it permanent. It should never have been a question. But now, finally, we have the chance to get this job done for our 9/11 heroes once and for all—our firefighters, our police officers, our EMTs, our construction workers, our survivors, our families who stayed in their homes at Ground Zero because EPA told them the air was safe.

This bill is a signal from our Nation, from this body, from Congress, that we

are representing people in all 50 States and that the Senate will live up to the words it has said over and over again, “never forget”—that we will never forget our 9/11 heroes and that we will never stop helping them when they are in need.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator’s time is expired.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. We will pass this bill for them, once and for all, so they can get back home where they belong.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the third time.

The bill was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. RISCH. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

(Disturbance in the Visitors’ Galleries.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Expression of approval is not permitted in the Galleries.

The result was announced—yeas 97, nays 2, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 224 Leg.]

YEAS—97

Alexander	Gardner	Reed
Baldwin	Gillibrand	Risch
Barrasso	Graham	Roberts
Bennet	Grassley	Romney
Blackburn	Harris	Rosen
Blumenthal	Hassan	Rounds
Blunt	Hawley	Rubio
Booker	Heinrich	Sanders
Boozman	Hirono	Sasse
Braun	Hoeven	Schatz
Brown	Hyde-Smith	Schumer
Burr	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Cantwell	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Capito	Jones	Shaheen
Cardin	Kaine	Shelby
Carper	Kennedy	Sinema
Casey	King	Smith
Cassidy	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Collins	Lankford	Sullivan
Coons	Leahy	Tester
Cornyn	Manchin	Thune
Cortez Masto	Markey	Tillis
Cotton	McConnell	Toomey
Cramer	McSally	Udall
Crapo	Menendez	Van Hollen
Cruz	Merkley	Warner
Daines	Moran	Warren
Duckworth	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Durbin	Murphy	Wicker
Enzi	Murray	Wyden
Ernst	Perdue	Young
Feinstein	Peters	
Fischer	Portman	

NAYS—2

Lee Paul

NOT VOTING—1

Isakson

The bill (H.R. 1327) was passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume executive session for the consideration of the unfinished business.

The Senator from Connecticut.

HEALTHCARE

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, I congratulate all of those responsible for the passage of this long-overdue legislation. I thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who made this happen but first and foremost all of the advocates all over the country but primarily in and around the Northeast. There were hundreds upon hundreds of individuals who rushed to that scene from my State of Connecticut, many of them dealing with potentially terminal diseases as a result of that action. I am glad we have stepped up in a bipartisan way and once again done the right thing.

I am on the floor to continue the conversation about healthcare. I wish I had as good news as comes with the passage of this legislation, which is going to extend the guarantee of healthcare to all sorts of heroes in and around New York. At the very same time, we are dealing with a potential calamity for millions of other Americans who also have serious conditions, who are dealing with diagnoses like cancer.

Today, if you have a preexisting condition, you know you are going to be able to get insured for that preexisting condition. If you are the parent of a child who has a serious illness, you don't have to worry about being denied care for your son or daughter because of that diagnosis. That is because we have the Affordable Care Act.

The Affordable Care Act has been on the books now for going on a decade. It says: No matter how sick you are, no insurance company can deny you care. That has made a world of difference for millions upon millions of Americans who have preexisting conditions.

The potential calamity comes in a court case filed by Republican Attorneys General, supported by the President and by Republicans in this Congress, that would try to use the court system to do what the Congress would not—overturn the entirety of the Affordable Care Act. Congress wouldn't do that. We debated it. We voted down measures to repeal the Affordable Care Act. Why? Because Americans all across this country rose up and said: We want you to fix what continues to be broken with the healthcare system, not tear down my coverage, not remove me from the rolls of those who are insured.

All across the country, over 20 million people have insurance just because of the Affordable Care Act—either because of tax credits we give people to afford private insurance or the 12 million people who got Medicaid because of the Affordable Care Act, never mind

all the folks who buy private insurance on their own, who can finally afford it because we don't discriminate against you if you are poor. People didn't want that taken away from them, so they rose up all across the country, and Congress listened. By the skin of our teeth, we voted down legislation to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

Because opponents of the Affordable Care Act—in particular, this President and Republicans who don't like it—couldn't get the job done in the people's branch, they are now going to the courts to try to repeal the Affordable Care Act. Right now weaving its way through the court system is a case called *Texas v. United States*. I won't go into the complicated legal argument. The goal of it, if it is successful, is to wipe out the entirety of the Affordable Care Act overnight. It has been successful at the district court level. It was just argued before the appellate court level, and by the account of witnesses who were there, the arguments didn't go too well for those of us who think the Affordable Care Act should stick around.

There is just a simple question right now for my colleagues: Do you support *Texas v. United States*? Do you support the lawsuit that would wipe out the entirety of the Affordable Care Act overnight and replace it with nothing?

I put Republicans on here because I actually know what the answer is from the Democratic side of the aisle. Every single Democrat in the Senate opposes this lawsuit. It is not because every single Democrat thinks you shouldn't change anything about the healthcare system; it is because we don't think it is a very good idea to kick 20 million people off of insurance, jack up rates for people with preexisting conditions, and have nothing to replace it—nothing. That is what will happen if *Texas v. United States* is successful. Petitioners are asking for the whole act to be thrown out and nothing to replace it. That would be a humanitarian catastrophe in this country, if 20 million people all of a sudden woke up and found they didn't have insurance coverage any longer; if insurers were once again able to charge that family of a child with a cancer diagnosis two times, three times, four times as much.

The question for Republicans is, Do you support this lawsuit? I think we need to get some answers. I think we need to get some answers. Some of my colleagues are on record saying they hope it fails. More are on record saying they hope it succeeds. But I don't think this body can just box its eyes and ears to the reality of what would happen if this lawsuit succeeds.

We are not riding to the rescue this Congress. Let me just be honest with you. Given how fractious the debate is here about everything but in particular about healthcare, there is no way that the Congress and this dysfunctional White House can reassemble all of the protections in the Affordable Care Act if the courts wipe them out. That is

just not realistic. We don't debate anything on this floor any longer. We don't have the muscle to pass minor pieces of legislation like this body used to do 20 years ago, never mind a reordering and reconstruction of one-sixth of the American economy, which is what the healthcare system represents.

Republicans need to start making a decision. Do you support this lawsuit or do you not? If you do support it, you can't just say "Well, you know, if everybody loses insurance and rates go through the roof for people with pre-existing conditions, we will figure it out" without having a specific plan for how you are going to do that. It is not good enough to just say "I hope that lawsuit succeeds. I hope everybody loses their insurance. And then, the day after, we will come back and we will see if we can try to find people healthcare." That is irresponsible. That is not satisfactory. It isn't enough for people out there who are living life in fear that their insurance is about to vanish.

The problem is, the last time Republicans started thinking about what they would want to replace the Affordable Care Act with, it was a joke. It was a joke. The Better Care Reconciliation Act, which was Senate Republicans' replacement for the Affordable Care Act—CBO found that it would increase the number of people without insurance by 22 million. It found that by 2026, an estimated 49 million people would be without insurance, almost doubling the number who lack insurance today. That is not better care; that is much, much worse care. So forgive me if I don't have confidence that my Republican friends who run the Senate today are going to have a plan to deal with a successful *Texas v. United States* court case that keeps insurance for people in my State, the 111,000 people in Connecticut who get insurance through the private market with ACA subsidies and the 268,000 people in Connecticut who are covered in my State under the Medicaid expansion.

It is time for everybody in this body, whether Republican or Democrat, to step up and say: A, do I support the lawsuit to get rid of all of the protections in the Affordable Care Act, with nothing to replace it, and B, do I have a plan for what to do if the lawsuit that I support is successful?

Chris, from Westbrook, CT, is asking that question of everybody in this Chamber. Here is what he said:

I am a 30 year old patient living with muscular dystrophy type 2B. Preexisting conditions can happen to anyone. . . . Disease does not discriminate. . . . No amount of pre-planning or prudence can stop you from preventing a genetic disease, for example. . . . You can be healthy one day, and have a health crisis the next. Everyone knows someone with a preexisting condition. It is a lifesaver—having insurance when you have a preexisting condition means being able to afford lifesaving medicines and treatments.

Chris is watching carefully to see what the answer to this question is.

Jeff in Enfield, CT, told me that in 2012, at the age of 7, his daughter was diagnosed with type 1 diabetes. He said:

By the time we noticed the symptoms and took her to the doctor, she most likely had only a couple weeks left to live. She is healthy today thanks to a daily regimen of insulin. But insulin in the U.S. costs five to ten times what it costs everywhere else. . . . Without insurance, the expense of keeping our daughter alive would ruin us. The prospect of my daughter being un-insurable is terrifying. . . . Without the ACA's insurance protections, the problem would be epidemic.

The problem of people not being able to afford insulin all across this country.

Jeff continued:

How can anyone be expected to live under that kind of strain, especially a young person just starting out in life?

I am asking this question of my colleagues on behalf of my constituents, but millions of Americans who are sick or have a child who is sick and tired of Congress playing politics with healthcare. You may not love everything that is in the Affordable Care Act. I get it. Republicans didn't vote for it. They didn't support it. They have been consistent in trying to get rid of it ever since it was put into law. I understand that. But I have taken my Republican friends at their word over the last 10 years when they have said: We want to repeal the Affordable Care Act and replace it with something better.

Asking the courts to overturn the entirety of the act with no plan to replace it is an abdication of the promise that has been made. I don't begrudge people trying to repeal a law they don't like if they think they can do something better, but Congress didn't repeal the Affordable Care Act because people didn't want us to do it.

This is an irresponsible and thoughtless mechanism to try to score a political victory, but it ends up playing with lots of people's lives.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HONORING FORMER ASSOCIATE JUSTICE JOHN PAUL STEVENS OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, today America lays to rest the great Justice John Paul Stevens. On behalf of the U.S. Senate, it is my privilege, along with my Illinois colleague Senator DUCKWORTH, to introduce and have adopted a bipartisan resolution honoring this remarkable and noble man, a native of the city of Chicago.

During his Supreme Court confirmation hearings in 1975, then-Judge John

Paul Stevens faced a line of questioning about his health, which, in retrospect, is amusing. They were asking questions about his health 44 years ago. Justice Stevens had undergone a single bypass heart surgery 2 years earlier, and the members of the Judiciary Committee just wanted to make sure he could handle the rigors of serving on the U.S. Supreme Court. History has shown us that Justice John Paul Stevens had not only a strong heart but a good heart when it came to serving on the U.S. Supreme Court.

Sadly, that mighty heart finally did stop beating last week. Justice Stevens was 99 years old. He died peacefully with his daughters Elizabeth and Susan by his side.

My State of Illinois is proud to claim John Paul Stevens as a native son. He was a member of a prominent Chicago family, and he grew up in the luxury of his family's hotel, then known as the Stevens Hotel and now known as the Hilton Hotel on Michigan Avenue. He never used the privilege of his family's wealth to shirk his responsibilities as a citizen of America.

In World War II he was a lieutenant commander in the Navy. He was awarded the Bronze Star for his service on the code-breaking team, whose work led to the downing of the plane of the man who had planned the attack on Pearl Harbor. After the war, he became an accomplished attorney and a champion of good, ethical government.

It was John Paul Stevens' integrity, as much as his brilliant legal mind, that convinced President Gerald Ford to nominate him, then a Federal judge on the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals, to serve on the U.S. Supreme Court in 1975. President Ford called then-Judge Stevens "the finest legal mind I could find." The Senate obviously agreed. The vote on the Senate floor for John Paul Stevens' confirmation was 98 to 0.

He was the second oldest and third longest serving Justice in the history of our Nation, but it is the quality of his service, and not its length, that most distinguishes John Paul Stevens' career on the U.S. Supreme Court. Justice Stevens approached disputes fairly, squarely, and succinctly. He took great pains to understand all sides of a case and give all sides a fair hearing. He rejected the easy path of ideology, and he was willing to change his position when the facts warranted it.

He authored the majority opinions in some of the most famous and important Supreme Court decisions in his time. One example was in 2004. Justice Stevens wrote the majority opinion in which the Court, by a vote of 6 to 3, rejected the Bush administration's view that prisoners at Guantanamo Bay could be held beyond the reach of the law with no access to the Federal courts. The case was *Rasul v. Bush*.

In 1984, in the landmark *Chevron* case, Justice Stevens wrote an opinion for a unanimous Supreme Court about the deference owed to Agency interpre-

tations of Federal statutes, crafting a legal framework that has been cited in more than 11,000 subsequent judicial opinions.

He was also often brilliant in dissent. In his lengthy dissent in *Citizens United v. FEC* in 2010, Justice Stevens rejected the radical and, I personally believe, dangerous notion that corporations have essentially the same First Amendment rights as individuals and should be allowed to spend, potentially, unlimited amounts of money on campaigns.

President Eisenhower famously said that he made only two mistakes as President, "and they're both sitting on the Supreme Court."

President Ford felt just the opposite about his choice in Justice Stevens. In 2005, the year before his death, President Ford wrote of Justice Stevens: "I am prepared to allow history's judgment of my term in office to rest (if necessary, exclusively) on my nomination 30 years ago of John Paul Stevens to the U.S. Supreme Court." I can think of no higher praise.

Justice Stevens stepped down from the Supreme Court 9 years ago. Anyone who had hoped that he might slip quietly into retirement was certainly disappointed. He continued in his retirement to speak and write forcefully and eloquently on major issues facing America.

In 2014, he testified before the Senate Rules Committee on the dangers that dark money in politics posed to American democracy.

He wrote three books. Justice Stevens once told an interviewer that the person who most motivated him to write was a professor from whom he took a poetry class at the University of Chicago. The professor's name was Norman Maclean. In his own retirement, Norman Maclean wrote a semi-autobiographical novel entitled, "A River Runs Through It and Other Stories." It was later made into a movie starring Robert Redford.

Looking at the life's work of John Paul Stevens, it is clear that a river ran through his life too. The currents in that river included a reverence for American democracy and the Constitution, compassion and respect for individuals, and a painstaking commitment to decide each case on its merits rather than relying on easy answers suggested by political ideology.

Justice John Paul Stevens was a good man and a courageous man, whose strong heart was matched by a brilliant mind, ceaseless curiosity, and a fierce commitment to justice. He fought the good fight. He served our Nation with honor, and he safeguarded and enriched our democracy. May he rest in peace and honor.

Madam President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 282, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 282) honoring former Associate Justice John Paul Stevens of the Supreme Court of the United States.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. DURBIN. I further ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to consider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 282) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I made my second trip to the southern border just this last Friday with, I believe, 14 of my Senate Democratic colleagues. It is the largest congressional delegation I have ever been a part of for this type of assignment. We went to McAllen, TX.

Approximately 40 percent of those who present themselves at our border come through this McAllen, TX, post. There is a port of entry there where many people, of course, are detained when they present themselves at nearby border positions.

Just a few months before, I had been to El Paso, TX, and, in El Paso, about 20 percent of those who come to our southern border present themselves as well. It was an eye opener and an emotional experience to see the hundreds of people who are being held in detention at our border in McAllen.

There were two contrasting images. One of them was the image of a Catholic nun, Sister Norma Pimentel, who has, for most of her adult life, dedicated herself to those who come to our border seeking rescue and security. Catholic Charities in McAllen, TX, has an extraordinary center filled with volunteers from all over the United States. I met some people from the city of Chicago and the State of Illinois and from all across the Nation who had given up their daily lives to come down and volunteer and do the basics—cook food, clean up, pass out toiletries, and offer a helping hand to many people who have just gone through the worst struggle in their lives.

Sister Norma is an extraordinary person, and she has really touched the hearts of so many people in her caring and loving way. It is a reminder time and again of the goodness of so many Americans who want to tell the world that we are in fact a nation driven by values of importance.

It was my good fortune to have breakfast with her and then spend another part of my day with her and my Senate colleagues. That hour—that hour I will never forget—is when I saw these people, many of whom had struggled for weeks, a month, days and days to get to the border of the United

States. They had gone through life experiences that we wouldn't wish on anyone. They were victims of assault, rape, and crimes that were committed against them, but they were leaving determined to come to the U.S. border.

Many of them told stories, particularly from the countries of Guatemala, El Salvador, and Honduras, about what they had been through and the threats to their families in these countries, which are largely lawless now, as these drug gangs and others threaten their children and them. It was in desperation that many of them made this journey, cashing in everything they owned on Earth to try to make it to the border of the United States.

Theirs is today's story, but it really is the story of this country that goes back for many years. It was 108 years ago that my grandmother decided to make her journey to the United States with three small children. She brought her two daughters and her son from the country of Lithuania to become immigrants to the United States. Her 2-year-old daughter, which she carried in her arms, was my mother, and I am a proud son of that Lithuanian immigrant.

Why did they come to the United States? Simply because they heard there was a better chance for a better future if they made it here.

That is the story of this country. We are being tested now at this time in this generation as to whether that story is still alive. Now, we understand there are some basics here. I hope we can all agree on them. Perhaps some will not, but I believe they are important.

The first is that we need border security. In an age of terrorism with the worst drug epidemic in the history of our Nation, it is right for us to know who is coming into this country and what they are bringing into our country.

Secondly, we want to make certain that anyone who is known to be a danger in this country is never allowed admittance, and those who are here undocumented and who commit a serious crime have forfeited their right to stay, as far as I am concerned—no questions asked beyond that.

The third thing is that we have to have an orderly immigration system. We cannot absorb every person in the world who wants to come to the United States at this moment. It just is not in our best interest. It really isn't in theirs either. We need an orderly immigration process. The question we have to ask ourselves is this: If we agree on those three things, can we then agree that we have a broken immigration system that needs to be repaired? Can we agree that people who do present themselves at the border will be treated in a humane fashion?

I told the story of Sister Norma, but if you look at the immigration policy of the Trump administration, you find a much different message to the world. We remember when this President ini-

tiated his Presidency by establishing a Muslim travel ban, creating chaos at airports across the country, and continued to separate thousands of American families. We remember the policy of this administration when the President announced the repeal of DACA. DACA, the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, is a program that grew out of the DREAM Act, a bill that I introduced about 18 years ago. It was a bill that said—or an Executive decision, actually, under President Obama: If you were brought to this country as a child, and your parents made the decision to come, and you were just along for the ride, but you lived in this country, got an education in this country, and didn't create serious crimes in this country, you deserve a chance.

You got up every morning and went to school and pledged allegiance to that flag and believed it was your own, and, then, probably when you were about 10 or 12, someone in the family told you something that you never heard before: You were not legally in America.

What should we do with these young people? Well, when I introduced this bill 18 years ago, my plan was to give them a chance to earn their way to legal status, finish their education, make certain that they have no serious criminal record, be willing to serve this country in the Armed Forces—and so many of them are—be willing to go on to school and develop a degree in teaching, engineering, nursing, or medicine, and then we gave you a chance for a green card and a path to legalization and citizenship in America.

In 18 years, I have never been able to make this the law of the land, but I prevailed on President Obama to create a program based on this premise, and he created the DACA Program. Now, over 800,000 young people in America stepped up, paid a \$600 filing fee, went through a criminal background check, and they were given permission to stay in this country without fear of deportation and with permission to work in this country as well.

Who are they? There are so many different people. I have introduced them on the floor today—I mean other days, I should say—with color photographs and telling their stories. The ones I think of immediately, the stars of the class, as far as I am concerned, are the more than 30 of these DACA students who are currently enrolled in the Loyola University Stritch School of Medicine in Chicago, which made the competition for the school of medicine open to DACA recipients, and they competed openly and won 32 slots.

In order to pay for their education, because they don't qualify for Federal assistance to go to school, my State of Illinois loans them money, and for each year that they are loaned money, they promise to serve a year, once they are licensed physicians, in an area of medical need in my State. What a wonderful program that takes into account their skills and talent and our need in

the State for medical care in rural communities in Smalltown, America, and in the inner city of Chicago and other big cities in my State.

Well, the President of the United States decided to end the program that made them eligible to apply for medical school, and in making that decision, the President jeopardized the completion of their medical degrees because, you see, no matter how hard they worked, that medical degree leads to a residency where they learn how to practice medicine hands on, and a residency is a job, and to be legally entitled to work in this country, you need to have DACA protection, which President Trump took away.

So many of them faced the prospect that their medical education would end because of the President's decision. Fortunately for them, the case was brought to Federal court to try to stop President Trump from eliminating DACA, and it provided us with a program that will continue with its protections until the court case is resolved. That could happen, and it could happen soon.

It tells you what happens when a President makes a decision that affects so many lives and the damage that it can do, not just to them and their families but to our Nation.

The President also terminated the Temporary Protected Status Program for multiple countries that protected some 300,000 people who have come to the United States over the years because of adverse natural disasters or political conditions in their country.

Then the President, last year, initiated a program called "Zero Tolerance" that resulted in the disastrous separation of thousands of families at the border. Because a Federal court mandated it, the administration had to account for the children who were separated. There were some 2,880 infants, toddlers, and children taken away from their parents, some with lies about where these children were going and how soon they would be returned.

This is what the court said in Southern California to the Trump administration: Account for these children. Tell us where they are today. Tell us where their parents are.

They couldn't even match up all the children with the parents because many of the parents had been sent back to their countries with the promise that the children would return, and there was no recordkeeping so that could be done.

This President also was engaged, through his Department of Homeland Security, in migrant detention facilities, where the inspector general with the Department of Homeland Security found "an immediate risk to the health and safety of detainees and DHS employees."

I saw them in April of this year in El Paso. We had a detention facility there where they were holding those who were presented at the border. The sign over the door of that detention center

said: Capacity 35. I looked through the plate glass window. There were 150 men standing shoulder to shoulder. They ate standing up. There was no room for all of them to lie down and sleep. I was told a couple of weeks later that the population census had grown to 200 in that cell that was designed for 35, with 1 toilet.

Next to it was a detention cell with another plate glass window. Over the door, it said: Capacity 18. I counted 75 women, some with nursing children, in that room designed for 18 people, with 1 toilet.

That situation is unacceptable and inhumane. Regardless of the legal outcome of those who present themselves, we can and must do better as a nation. The inspector general is right. That condition that I saw was a risk to health and safety.

Then, the President, through a series of his infamous tweets, threatened mass arrests and deportations of millions of immigrants who have committed no crime and posed no threat to the safety and security of their communities. What the President has done is created rampant fear in the immigrant communities around Illinois and around this Nation.

Then, the President put in place a new rule that blocks asylum claims at our border for nationals of any country except Mexico, including families and children fleeing persecution. The UNHCR, the United Nations refugee agency, said that the rule that the President promulgated will endanger vulnerable people in need of international protection from violence or persecution.

Now the President is continuing on his path of destruction. He is considering reducing the number of refugees that the United States will admit in the year 2020 to zero.

You have to go back in history to World War II, when the President of the United States, a member of my own political party, made a conscious decision to tell those Jewish people coming from Europe that they would not be allowed admittance into the United States to escape the Nazi Holocaust. The story of the SS *St. Louis* is one that people should read and consider the 800 passengers on that ship who were rejected by the administration as refugees and sent back to Europe. A fourth of them died in the Holocaust.

Because of our feeling of shame after World War II, the United States, under Presidents of both political parties, said that we would try to set a standard for the world when it came to accepting refugees, and we did. An average of almost 80,000 per year were admitted into the United States. Think back to the Cubans who came to this country to escape communism under Castro. They have become such a vibrant part of America today, and in fact, three of the Senators today are of Cuban decent. They were part of that refugee movement—maybe not their generation but in their family.

Then, of course, we accepted Jewish people from the Soviet Union, who were being persecuted. Soviet Jews found a welcoming America. The Vietnamese who risked their lives to fight on our side in that horrible war were welcomed into the United States rather than see them face persecution in their own countries.

The story goes on and on and for years and years. For decades the United States established a standard of caring when it came to refugees. Now this President has announced that despite all of the turmoil in the world, we cannot accept a single refugee in the year 2020. What a departure from the high-minded and high-valued conduct of previous Presidents.

Since the enactment of the Refugee Act of 1980, the United States has resettled over 80,000 refugees per year under the administrations of both political parties. President Trump has said he will end it.

For the last 2 years, the Trump administration has set the lowest refugee ceilings in history in the midst of the worst refugee crisis in history. Now the administration may slam the door at least for a year or until someone prevails on the President.

Today, as almost every day, the administration has announced a new rule that allows immigration officers to arrest and deport undocumented immigrants anywhere in the United States unless that person can prove they have been in the United States for at least 2 years. I ask, if someone stopped you on the street and said "Prove you have been here for 2 years," how long would it take you to gather that documentation to make that proof, if you can? To do this to people and threaten to deport them on the spot immediately if they don't produce the documentation is totally unfair. This procedure, known as expedited removal, allows an immigrant to be deported without consulting with an attorney or counselor or defending themselves in a hearing before an immigration judge. It is summary judgment on the street to deport people and tear families apart.

America is better than this. We can certainly keep America safe and respect our heritage as a nation of immigrants. We can have a secure border and abide by our international obligations to protect refugees fleeing persecution as we have done on a bipartisan basis for decades.

When I went and toured the McAllen Border Patrol station, Donna, and Urcula, we met with many of the leaders there and saw firsthand what is happening. We are starting to build facilities that will be more humane, at least by design, and hope that is exactly what happens.

I would like to say a word about the men and women who work for Customs and Border Protection. I am not going to make any excuses for those who have abused people in the past or those who have said horrible things online about them—no excuses at all. But the

people I met as part of our government service at the border were overwhelmingly good and caring people who are confronted with a situation at the border that they never envisioned with circumstances beyond their control. So I want to say a word for those who are doing the best they can under these extraordinary circumstances and thank them for their service.

The reality is that President Trump's policies, as harsh and cruel as they have been, have been ineffective at our southern border. The situation is much less secure than when he took office. The President's obsession with the border wall led to the longest government shutdown in history, even paralyzing our immigration courts for that 35-day period.

More refugees have been driven to the border because the President has shut down the legal avenues for migration and blocked all assistance to stabilize the Northern Triangle countries.

Under President Obama we set up in-country in Guatemala, El Salvador, and Honduras an opportunity for those who wished to come forward and apply for asylum status in the United States without leaving their own country if they chose to do it. It was one alternative to an expensive, dangerous trek to the southern border. The Trump administration closed down that program, giving the people in those countries no other alternative but to try to make that trip to the border. That made no sense at all.

There is also a gaping leadership vacuum at the Department of Homeland Security. In the 2½ years the President has been in office, there have been four different leaders in the Office of the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security, and in every major subcategory position, whether it is interior enforcement or border enforcement, there have been at least as many people in an acting capacity and not in a permanent capacity.

I will say that we have tried our best to work with this administration when they have asked for help and volunteered it when they didn't. Last February, when we passed the omnibus bill, we included over \$400 million for humanitarian assistance at the border, and when the President came back and asked for an emergency supplemental of \$4.6 billion for additional funding, Democrats joined Republicans to pass that legislation.

Last year, before the border crisis began, Senate Democrats supported a bipartisan agreement, including robust border security funding and dozens of provisions to strengthen border security. But the President threatened to veto it, and instead pushed for a hard-line approach, which, when it was called for a vote in the U.S. Senate, received fewer than 40 votes.

Six years ago, in 2013, there was a problem on the Senate floor, and there aren't many to recall as we stand here today, but this was one of them. I was part of the Gang of 8, four Democrat

and four Republican Senators who worked for months—Senator John McCain, CHUCK SCHUMER, and many others—to put together a comprehensive immigration reform bill. We brought it to the floor of the Senate, and it passed 68 to 32. It was a step and a move in the right direction to deal with our broken immigration system. Unfortunately, the Republican House leadership refused to even consider that bill or call for a hearing. The Acting Secretary of Department of Homeland Security, Kevin McAleenan, said that if our bill in 2013 had been enacted into law, “we would have a very different situation. . . . we would be a lot more secure on our border.”

Republican Senator LAMAR ALEXANDER of Tennessee, who supported that bill, said “If that bill became law, most of the problems we're having today we'd not be having.”

We had a path, a bipartisan path, a good path that we should return to. It is time for us to find a way to work together for a secure border, for a secure nation, to reduce the massive amounts of money that are being spent now because of this migration, and to do it in a humane fashion consistent with the values of the United States.

We are ready to work with Republicans. Democrats on this side of the aisle are ready to work to achieve goals I think we all share. We need to address the root causes in the Northern Triangle countries that drive migrants to flee to the United States. We need to crack down on the traffickers and transporters who are exploiting these migrants. We need to expand third-country resettlement so that immigrants can find their way safely without making that dangerous trek. We need to eliminate immigration court backlogs so that asylum claims can be processed more quickly. We need to expand the use of proven alternatives to detention, like family case management, so immigrants know their rights and show up for court.

It was hard to believe, when we went to Sister Norma's cafeteria centered in McAllen—some of the migrants who had gone through the system and were now heading to join family members in the United States showed us the packets they were given with legal documents. Understand, these people were fresh off the border, out of detention. As we looked inside the packets, we found in many cases that the instructions were printed in English, not Spanish, and they did not include any specific time or place for the person to report. They had simply typed in “to be determined.” Is it any wonder that people struggle to come to a court hearing as required by law?

We can do better. We need to get them the information they need if they are going to be a part of our legal system and tell them the time and place they need to report.

We stand ready to work on this side of the aisle for smart, effective, humane border security policy. We need

to have a bipartisan approach. Republican colleagues need to step up and find a constructive way to deal with the challenges we face on the border today. We can keep America safe. We can continue to probably call ourselves a nation of immigrants. What we are seeing now is a situation which begs for a bipartisan, compromise solution.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASIDY). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MUELLER REPORT

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I come to the floor just the day before Robert Mueller is set to come before the House Intelligence and Judiciary Committees to focus attention on some of the key findings of the special counsel's report on Russia's interference in our 2016 elections.

I have spoken on the floor many times about the depth and breadth of the Russian interference in the 2016 election. The special counsel's report goes to great lengths to detail this, in his terms, “sweeping and systemic interference.” What continues to be worrisome is that these information warfare attacks and other malign influence operations are ongoing with more plans for our elections next year.

This threat to our national security and the integrity of our democracy has yet to be sufficiently recognized or counted by this administration. Indeed, in the months since the report was released, the Trump administration and congressional Republicans have repeatedly claimed that the report vindicates the President on all charges of collusion between the Trump campaign and Russia and on obstruction of justice rather than taking steps to ensure that we will never be targeted in this way again.

The special counsel's testimony is vital so he can detail what he uncovered and shed additional light on the events of the investigation. In particular, what Congress and the American people need to hear from Director Mueller relates to three broad categories of questions. For instance, what was the full scope of Russian interference in the 2016 election?

Second, what evidence did the special counsel find of coordination between Trump campaign associates or the President and the Russian Government, and why did he decide the available evidence was not sufficient to prove a criminal conspiracy with Russia?

Third, what evidence did the special counsel find that the President obstructed justice?

Tomorrow's testimony will help the public understand the gravity of the President's conduct in the White House

and the extent to which Russia influenced the 2016 election. These hearings are not the end. This is not case closed. The intelligence community has assessed that the threat from Russia will continue to evolve and grow even more sophisticated. For our elections to remain free, open, and transparent, we must take seriously the threat posed by Russia and other potential foreign adversaries. We must hold hearings in the Senate with testimony from the special counsel's office and key witnesses from the report. We must consider legislation on election security, foreign influence operations, disinformation, Federal election laws, money laundering, and many other issues.

When it comes to protecting our democracy, we cannot be complacent. Now is the time for action to make sure we are ready ahead of the elections in 2020 and beyond. Each and every one of us in this Chamber swore an oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic. In order to do that, we can't just take tweets about no collusion and no obstruction at face value. This isn't a witch hunt, nor should it be an effort to circle the partisan wagons around the President and absolve him of any wrongdoing. It has to be a serious examination of what happened and how to defend our Nation against future attacks.

Mr. President, in anticipation of the upcoming testimony of the special counsel before the House Intelligence and Judiciary Committees, I want to highlight key findings in his report that go to the heart of Russian interference into our elections in 2016 and the ongoing threat still facing our national security and the integrity of our democracy.

Indeed many of the President's own national security officials have warned of heightened Russian information warfare attacks and other foreign influence operations in next year's election—which could make its 2016 interference in our elections, catalogued in the Mueller report, look like child's play. Federal Bureau of Investigation Director Wray recently stated that the 2018 midterm elections were seen by Russia as “a dress rehearsal for the big show in 2020.” Wray added that the FBI anticipates the 2020 “threat being even more challenging.” Director of National Intelligence Daniel Coats warned the Senate Intelligence Committee in January 2019 that, in the 2020 election cycle, “Moscow may employ additional influence toolkits—such as spreading disinformation, conducting hack-and-leak operations, or manipulating data—in a more targeted fashion to influence U.S. policy, actions, and elections.”

Despite this ongoing and increasingly sophisticated threat, we are still not fully prepared to defend against the inevitable Russian attacks on our democracy. The Russian interference in the

2016 election was akin to a military operation against our nation. To date, we do not have a complete understanding of what happened in 2016. More importantly, we do not have a comprehensive strategy, nor have we reorganized our government or prepared the American people, so that such foreign interference will not happen again. The release of the Mueller report cannot mark the end of the strategy to investigate and prevent Russian interference. The special counsel's testimony will add to the urgency for this administration and Congress to change course and act immediately to protect our democracy and strengthen public faith in the American election process.

Since the release of the special counsel's report, the President, the Attorney General, and some Republican congressional leaders have said that the case of Russian interference in the 2016 election is closed, that our work is done, and that we can move on. The President has repeatedly claimed that the special counsel's report cleared him of any connections to Russia and any wrongdoing in contradiction of the voluminous evidence laid out in the report. But those declarations of innocence just don't square with the facts. Congress has a constitutional duty to review the findings of the special counsel on behalf of the American people and not simply accept the administration's spin and mischaracterizations of Robert Mueller's findings.

Despite the President's declarations of “hoax” and “witch hunt,” the special counsel's office did bring indictments for “conspiracy to commit offense or to defraud the United States” under 18 U.S. Code §371, against Putin crony Yevgeny Prigozhin, who was in charge of the Kremlin-linked troll operation known as the Internet Research Agency, and against his related holdings and multiple employees. The investigation also resulted in conspiracy indictments of 12 officers from Russian Military Intelligence, also known as the GRU.

While the available evidence did not meet the legal standard to charge the President or his associates with a crime for a coordinating role in that conspiracy, the special counsel takes care to note that does not mean that evidence of coordination does not exist. This is not, as the President has attested, “a complete and total exoneration.” As the special counsel plainly points out, in regards to coordination with Russia, while “this report embodies factual and legal determinations that the office believes to be accurate and complete to the greatest extent possible, given these identified gaps, the office cannot rule out the possibility that the unavailable information would shed additional light on (or cast in a new light) the events described in this report.”

What is more, President Trump and his supporters purposefully leave out important context from the report where the special counsel explains that

he lacked the authority to indict a sitting President because of an Office of Legal Counsel, OLC, opinion finding that “the indictment or criminal prosecution of a sitting President would impermissibly undermine the capacity of the executive branch to perform its constitutionally assigned functions” in violation of “the constitutional separation of powers.”

Another critical consideration for the special counsel was that a Federal criminal investigation of a sitting President could preempt the authority vested in Congress by the Constitution to address Presidential misconduct. In addition, Mueller notes that “a President does not have immunity after he leaves office” and that “we conducted a thorough factual investigation in order to preserve the evidence when memories were fresh and documentary materials were available.” Put together, while the special counsel concluded that he could not prosecute the President, he makes it clear that he is creating a record of evidence and deferring to Congress and future prosecutors should they pursue an obstruction case.

Which is all the more reason why we must hear from the special counsel on his findings and his decision-making process. In particular, what Congress and the American people need to hear from Special Counsel Mueller relates to three broad categories of questions.

First, what was the nature and extent of the Russian interference campaign launched against the United States in the 2016 election? Second, what evidence did the investigation find of Trump campaign associates or the President coordinating with the Russian campaign, and why did Mueller decide the available evidence was not sufficient to prove “beyond a reasonable doubt” that they had criminally conspired with the Russian efforts? And the third set of issues relate to acts of obstruction by Trump campaign associates and the President himself.

On the first set of issues, one of the main responsibilities charged to the special counsel by the Department of Justice was to conduct a “full and thorough investigation of the Russian government's efforts to interfere in the 2016 presidential election.” As the report concludes, “the Special Counsel's investigation established that Russia interfered in the 2016 election principally through two operations.”

First, Mueller provides detailed evidence that Kremlin-linked operators sought to help the Kremlin's preferred candidate, whose election would serve Russia's interests. The report describes how a Kremlin-linked troll operation, called the Internet Research Agency, “carried out a social media campaign that favored presidential candidate Donald J. Trump and disparaged presidential candidate Hillary Clinton.” It also found that “[a]s early as 2014, the [Kremlin-linked Internet Research Agency] instructed its employees to

target U.S. persons who could be used to advance its operational goals.”

Second, Mueller describes in detail the Russian spying operation to steal “dirt” on the opposition candidate and then use that stolen information against her. The report states unequivocally, “[a] Russian military intelligence’s spying operation conducted computer intrusion operations against entities, employees and volunteers working on the Clinton Campaign and then released stolen documents.”

The Mueller report makes clear that the Russian election interference was a coordinated campaign targeting our democracy along multiple lines of effort. While these conclusions affirm the assessments of our intelligence community, the President appears unwilling or unable to take them seriously.

At the G20 Summit in Osaka in June 2019, President Trump treated Russian election interference as a joke, signaling to Putin that he would not hold Russia accountable. And in a recent interview, the President failed to grasp what was wrong with taking “dirt” on his political opponent from a foreign source and indicated that, if it happened again in the 2020 campaign, he would listen to what they had to say and then decide whether or not to report it to the FBI.

Now let me turn to the second set of issues Special Counsel Mueller needs to address, relating to his task by the Department of Justice to investigate “any links and/or coordination between the Russian government and individuals associated with the campaign of President Donald Trump.”

The special counsel’s report presents significant evidence that President Trump and his associates embraced, encouraged, and applauded Russian help. The report definitively concludes that Russia saw its interests as aligned with, and served by, a Trump Presidency; that a central purpose of the Russian interference operations was helping the Trump campaign; and that the Trump campaign anticipated benefiting from the fruits of that foreign election interference. Mueller provides detailed evidence of multiple contacts by Russian government officials or their proxies with the Trump campaign to facilitate relationships. The report states: “[t]he investigation . . . established numerous links between the Russian government and the Trump campaign.”

Ultimately, however, the special counsel’s investigation lacked sufficient evidence to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the Trump campaign or its associates conspired with the Russian Government in its election interference. As the report states: “[a]lthough the investigation established that the Russian government perceived it would benefit from a Trump presidency and worked to secure that outcome, and that the Campaign expected it would benefit electorally from information stolen and released through Russian efforts,

the investigation did not establish that members of the Trump Campaign conspired or coordinated with the Russian government in its election interference activities.”

As referenced earlier, a key question that Special Counsel Mueller needs to address during his testimony is why was the investigative team unable to establish to a criminal standard of proof that is “beyond a reasonable doubt” coordination between people associated with the Trump campaign, and Russian actors conspiring to undermine the U.S. elections.

This raises questions related to the third set of issues for Special Counsel Mueller, namely whether the President obstructed justice in connection with the Russia-related investigation and hindered the ability of the special counsel’s office to gather relevant evidence. And if so, did that obstruction materially impede Mueller’s ability to conclude “beyond a reasonable doubt” that the Trump campaign or the President himself conspired with Russian interference? These questions raise profound issues for our national security and the integrity of our democracy, and the special counsel’s answers will determine what Congress’s next steps should be in meeting its constitutional responsibilities.

Indeed, the Mueller report establishes multiple incidents in which the President committed acts that were capable of impeding the Trump-Russia investigation. For example, President Trump asked then-FBI Director James Comey to stop looking into his former National Security Advisor General Michael Flynn, after finding out that Flynn was questioned about his contacts with the Russian Ambassador. President Trump also repeatedly asked Comey to publicly say that Trump himself was not under investigation and then fired Comey when it became clear he was unwilling to do so.

In addition, the President tried several different tactics to have the special counsel’s investigation curtailed. President Trump initially put forward claims that the special counsel had conflicts of interest, which his advisers informed him were meritless. When that did not work, the President gave his subordinates—including White House Counsel Don McGahn, White House Chief of Staff Reince Priebus and former campaign manager Corey Lewandowski—direct orders to either have the special counsel removed or to pressure then-Attorney General Sessions into limiting the scope of the special counsel’s investigation to future election interference, instead of scrutinizing the President and his campaign’s conduct.

McGahn, Lewandowski, and Priebus all failed to follow the President’s orders. The special counsel importantly notes that attempts “to influence the investigation were mostly unsuccessful, but that is largely because the persons who surrounded the president declined to carry out orders or accede to his requests.”

Furthermore, the special counsel’s report found that the President and his aides materially impaired the investigation. For instance, the President did not give an in-person interview to the special counsel and would only answer written questions that did not address issues relating to Presidential obstruction. In his written responses, the President replied that he could not recall or did not remember more than 30 times, covering the vast majority of the questions. In addition, numerous Trump campaign associates and others from his inner circle, including General Michael Flynn, George Papadopoulos, and Roger Stone, and his attorney Michael Cohen, lied about their dealings with Kremlin or Kremlin-linked actors. Michael Cohen, for example, admitted to the special counsel that among the reasons he lied to Congress about the Trump Tower Moscow project was to try and limit the ongoing Russia investigation. In each of these cases, the Mueller report found “those lies materially impaired the investigation of Russian election interference.”

Similarly, the special counsel found that Trump campaign associates frustrated the investigation by deleting information or otherwise impeding the ability of the special counsel to obtain relevant communications pertinent to the investigation. One example was Trump campaign associates’ communications with Konstantin Kilimnik, a Ukrainian national whom the FBI assesses as having ties to Russian intelligence and who worked for Trump campaign chairman Paul Manafort’s political consulting business for many years. During 2016, Manafort directed his campaign deputy Rick Gates to provide internal polling data to Kilimnik. Manafort expected Kilimnik to share that information with others in Ukraine and Putin crony Oleg Deripaska, who had funded pro-Kremlin political influence operations in the past. The Mueller report details that Gates used an encrypted app to send the polling data and then deleted it daily. As a result of deleted and encrypted communications and because of Manafort’s false statements, the special counsel was not able to determine what happened with this data and whether it was part of a coordinated effort between Russia and the Trump campaign to interfere in our election. The report makes clear that the lying, obfuscations, and denial of access to key information had a direct effect on the investigation’s ability to determine the nature and extent of any coordination by President Trump and his associates with Russian conspirators.

What makes the Mueller’s testimony even more urgent are the Trump administration’s efforts to attack the credibility of the report and to prevent Congress from further investigating Mueller’s findings. The White House has adopted a strategy of trying to block key witnesses named in the Mueller report from testifying before

Congress, including Don McGahn, Annie Donaldson who served as chief of staff to White Counsel McGahn, and White House and Trump campaign communications director Hope Hicks, by invoking legally dubious or overly broad claims of privilege. The White House has also stymied Congress by asserting Executive privilege over the full, unredacted version of the report and the underlying documents and only providing access to a few select Members.

It is not only the White House that has been trying to muddy the waters around the Mueller report. Attorney General William Barr has deliberately mischaracterized and increased partisan skepticism of the report. Before releasing the report to the public, Barr published a misleading summary of its findings, which the special counsel disputed. Barr also held a press conference where he claimed that the White House fully cooperated with the special counsel's investigation, that the special counsel found "no collusion," and that there was not sufficient evidence to establish obstruction of justice. These statements are favorable to the President, but none of them are consistent with the special counsel's findings.

As I have laid out, despite the ongoing and increasingly sophisticated threat we face and despite the 2020 election being less than a year and a half away, we are still not prepared to defend against the inevitable Russian attack on our democracy. As Mueller said during his press conference on May 29, 2019, "I will close by reiterating the central allegation of our indictments—that there were multiple, systematic efforts to interference in our election. That allegation deserves the attention of every American."

I could not agree more. We cannot forget that Russia interfered in our election in 2016 with hybrid warfare tactics and tried to do it again in 2018. And our intelligence community assessed that it is poised to conduct additional operations against our elections in 2020 with increasing sophistication. We cannot ignore these attacks or wish them away.

The impediments erected by the President and the people around him meant that despite the best efforts of the Mueller team, there remains unfinished business in getting to the bottom of what happened in 2016 and afterward, which is why it is critically important we hear from the special counsel.

While it is an important step that the special counsel is testifying to the House in front of two committees, I am making this statement about the questions that should be asked of Mueller because, as of this moment, there are no scheduled hearings or plan for him to appear in the Senate. We should be holding hearings in the Senate with testimony from the special counsel and others on many issues, including the ones I have raised. We should be passing legislation, including on election security, to ensure that we are appro-

priately reorganized across government and society ahead of the elections in 2020 and beyond. Indeed, the administration needs to take election security seriously. That means being proactive. It also means finding ways to reassure the American people about the legitimacy and validity of our elections. For example, we could require the Secretary of Homeland Security, with the concurrence of the Director of National Intelligence and the FBI Director, to rapidly assess and inform the public about whether any foreign interference or influence is detected against our election process, procedures, and infrastructure.

As Former Ambassador to Russia Michael McFaul wrote in the Washington Post after the special counsel's report was released: "the Mueller report is a good start, but it is only a start." There is too much at stake for our national security and the integrity of democracy to stop now.

NOMINATION OF MARK T. ESPER

Mr. President, I had the opportunity and the privilege, as we all did earlier today, to vote for Secretary Mark Esper as the next Secretary of Defense.

I have known Dr. Esper for more than a decade. He is a public servant and a patriot of the first order. I think the overwhelming vote today indicates the confidence we have in him, and it indicates the importance we understand that job holds for all of us. We have entrusted it to someone who began his dedicated service to the country as an 18-year-old at West Point, served in the Army, then went on to serve in administrations and as a public-spirited citizen through his entire life.

Mr. President, I rise to state my support for the nomination of Dr. Mark Esper, who was confirmed earlier today to be the 27th Secretary of Defense.

Dr. Esper has served this Nation in a variety of roles most of his life. He is a 1986 graduate of the U.S. Military Academy. He served in the 101st Airborne Division and participated in the 1990-91 Gulf War with the "Screaming Eagles." He retired from the U.S. Army in 2007, after spending 10 years on Active Duty and 11 years in the National Guard and Army Reserve.

After the Army, Dr. Esper worked in the private sector, but he also worked in several offices on Capitol Hill, including the offices of Senator and Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel and Senate Majority Leader Bill Frist. He also was a professional staff member on the Senate Foreign Relations and Senate Government Affairs committees and the House Armed Services Committee. Until his nomination to be Secretary of Defense, Dr. Esper was serving as the 23rd Secretary of the Army. His wealth of experience in defense policy and in senior leadership positions in both the public and private sector should serve him well as Secretary of Defense.

It has been nearly 7 months since the Department has had a Senate-confirmed Secretary of Defense. At no

other time in history has the office of the Secretary remained vacant for so long. In addition, we must bear in mind the national security challenges facing our country. Currently, the Department is focused on competition with near-peer adversaries like China and Russia. As the Department pursues the new strategic direction established by the National Defense Strategy, Iran and North Korea remain dangerous, and the threat posed by violent extremist organizations is not diminishing. Furthermore, the Department must continue to recruit and retain high-caliber individuals, while restoring readiness, and pursuing new high-end capabilities for the force.

Despite these daunting challenges, the number of senior-level civilian vacancies throughout the Department is staggering. The constant turnover of senior civilian leadership, coupled with the duration of these vacancies, has been troubling. I believe it has had a significant impact on the Defense Department, which is adrift in a way I have not seen in my time on Capitol Hill. It is my hope that Dr. Esper will work to fill these civilian leadership positions because it is necessary to manage the difficult challenges facing the Department, as well as the extensive Pentagon bureaucracy.

In addition, Dr. Esper will help oversee national security policy for a President whose temperament and management skills are challenging. It is extremely important for our Nation that he be surrounded by leaders who can provide thoughtful advice and counsel. Diversity of opinion is important when crafting policy and making decisions that impact the well-being of our men and women in uniform. It is my fervent hope that Dr. Esper will be willing and able to provide the President with his best policy advice even if the President disagrees with the counsel or it runs contrary to his policy goals.

But most importantly, while the Secretary of Defense serves at the pleasure of the President, we should never forget that they also oversee the finest fighting force in the world, men and women who have volunteered to serve a cause greater than themselves. Our servicemembers and their families should always be at the forefront when considering defense policy or military action.

On a final note, I would also like to thank Dr. Esper's family, his wife Leah and their children, Luke, John, and Kate. They, too, will be serving our country, and we appreciate their support.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF STEPHEN M. DICKSON

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, when it comes to air safety, the United States of America should be the gold standard for the world. In fact, better than the gold standard, it ought to be the Sullenberger standard.

We remember Sully Sullenberger, who was the pilot at the controls when the “Miracle on the Hudson” flight in 2009 landed safely. He prescribed the qualities that we should regard most highly as we choose a new Administrator of the FAA. He also gave us the leadership we need and should respect when considering the nomination of Stephen Dickson. We should reject it, and he articulated exactly why.

Chesley “Sully” Sullenberger said about Stephen Dickson that “his actions and words raise grave concerns about his ability to act with the integrity and the independence the next FAA Administrator must have to navigate the challenges of the ungrounding of the 737 MAX and to rebuild the global trust in the FAA’s confidence and ability to appropriately certify new aircraft design.” That is what he said in an interview with POLITICO, but he said it publicly on a number of other occasions. Those two qualities that he mandated in the next FAA Administrator as more important than any other—*independence and integrity*—are precisely the qualities that Stephen Dickson lacks. It is that failing which brings me to the floor now to oppose his nomination.

Sully Sullenberger highlighted the particular experience that exemplified that failing, which is Stephen Dickson’s involvement in a whistleblower case.

As I know from my experience as the U.S. attorney and attorney general, whistleblowers are the ones who bring information to light that can help save lives. Whether it is in the criminal area or air safety or drug effectiveness or many other areas, including other areas of transportation safety, whistleblowers play a vital role, so they need protection. They should never be retaliated against. They should never be objects of retribution. They should be protected and encouraged. That is what an air safety expert who really cares about safety—someone who respects independence and integrity—would do. That is exactly the opposite of what Stephen Dickson is alleged to have done in the case of Karlene Petitt.

Ms. Petitt’s case was brought to our attention after Stephen Dickson’s testimony to the Commerce Committee, so we had no real opportunity to ask him about it in his confirmation hearing. In fact, we never learned about Ms. Petitt’s case or a deposition that Dickson gave for it until after that hearing. He didn’t disclose it because he purportedly interpreted a Senate Commerce Committee questionnaire as asking about “my personal conduct and my behavior both in general and as an officer of a large public company or any instance in which I was named as

a party to a proceeding.” He didn’t think that a court case or a deposition fit that definition.

The simple fact is that Ms. Petitt alleged she was subject to retaliation after presenting Mr. Dickson and other Delta executives, including the current CEO, Ed Bastian, with a written report regarding Delta’s “Flight Operations’ Safety Culture” in January 2016. That report alleged significant facts that should have been investigated.

Following its submission and a meeting with a member of Delta’s human resources staff, Ms. Petitt was removed from duty. In fact, in March 2016, she was referred for a psychiatric examination. That is the way Delta reacted to her whistleblower complaint. The doctor chosen by Delta diagnosed her with bipolar disorder and found that she was unfit for duty. When she was evaluated by a panel of eight doctors at the Mayo Clinic and an independent third-party doctor, these psychiatrists concluded that Ms. Petitt did not, in fact, suffer from a mental illness and was entirely fit for duty.

The appearance and seemingly the reality is that her safety concerns were meant to be buried rather than taken seriously and addressed. Mr. Dickson played a part in that reaction to her whistleblower concerns. In fact, the psychiatrist who first evaluated her concluded that she must have this disorder because, as a woman, how can she be raising three young children and be studying for another possible degree and at the same time working as she was. That kind of evaluation was certainly entitled to very little respect.

Again, Mr. Dickson never disclosed it to us, so we could never ask him about it at the nomination hearing. He never disclosed it before that hearing. When he was called upon to explain this lapse, instead of taking ownership of his failing, he sought to minimize his involvement inconsistently with the facts of the case. His failure to disclose it and his reaction to it would itself be disqualifying, but there are other grounds as well.

He is simply not the right person for this agency at this time. Integrity and independence are now more important than ever because the airline industry and particularly Boeing need new leadership in oversight and accountability. New leadership from the FAA is critically important in light of its failure to ground those 737 MAX airplanes ahead of the rest of the world—in fact, the FAA follows the rest the world—and because of their delegation of authority for certification to Boeing and manufacturers generally. That delegation of authority essentially puts the fox in charge of the henhouse. It may have been for cost savings to the FAA because they could allow Boeing to hire, pay, and fire the certifiers, but at some level, it meant that Boeing then in effect controls the safety and scrutiny supposedly exercised by an independent FAA. That independence is critically important.

Mr. Dickson comes from a long career at Delta Airlines—in fact, a record at Delta that raises questions about his independence from the industry and at a time when that agency must guarantee its independence from that industry.

Our next FAA Administrator will, in fact, have enormous challenges in restoring public trust. This agency has been undermined by its failure to ground airplanes, to exercise independent judgment, and to do the kind of scrutiny necessary and what is needed, in fact, in new leadership. The FAA’s broken system—at least in public perception—requires a new voice, untainted by connections to the industry. We have an opportunity to find someone who will restore that confidence in America and worldwide.

He is very simply not the right person for this job, and I urge my colleagues to oppose him and to respect the advice given to us by Sully Sullenberger, who has highlighted those two qualities: *independence and integrity*—integrity not only in past careers but in dealings with the U.S. Senate, in full disclosure with respect to whistleblowers, in highlighting public safety above profits or interests of the industry. That is the kind of independence and integrity we need. I still have hope that we can find it if my colleagues join me in opposing this nomination.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MUELLER REPORT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, on April 8, this year I came to the Senate to speak about the end of the special counsel’s investigation. Now that Special Counsel Mueller is set to testify tomorrow in the House of Representatives, I would like to reiterate several points I made in that speech that I believe are still very relevant today.

I noted that the facts show the real collusion was actually brought about by the Democrats. It is pretty well documented that the Clinton campaign and the Democratic National Committee hired Fusion GPS to do opposition research against Candidate Trump.

Fusion GPS then hired Christopher Steele, a former British intelligence officer, to compile the famous Steele dossier. That document was central to the fake collusion narrative, and it reportedly used Russian Government sources for information.

So the Democrats paid for a document created by a foreign national that relied on Russian Government

sources. Let's also not forget about news reports that the Democratic National Committee interfaced with the Government of Ukraine to try and get dirt on Candidate Trump—not Trump but the Democrats. Now that is the definition of collusion. Maybe that is why the Democrats seem totally uninterested in figuring out the origins of the Russian investigation because they were a prime mover in making it all happen.

Now they have asked the Justice Department to produce the Mueller report's underlying evidence, including all intelligence-related information. I agree with the need to see as much information as possible. In fact, I have cosponsored a bill that would do just that, but the Democrats' fury over Mueller's findings and their inconsistent positions makes me think all of this is more about politics than principle.

As I have said repeatedly, to guard against political gamesmanship, there is only one legitimate way to do this. Let's see all the documents, every one of the documents; meaning, that if Congress is going to review the Mueller report's underlying information, it should be able to review information relating to how—absolutely how the Russia investigation started. Anything less will fail to provide the full picture.

Furthermore, to be very consistent, we shouldn't stop at the Russia investigation. The Democrats want all of the Mueller information but seem to be turning a very blind eye to other investigations where Congress, as well as the public, have yet to see it all. Again, that leads me to believe that their request for Mueller-related documents is a political ploy.

Take, for example, the Clinton investigation. As I have written about publicly before, the Justice Department inspector general produced to Congress a highly classified document relating to this Clinton investigation. That document raises additional questions for the FBI and the Justice Department. These agencies ought to produce additional information to Congress and answer these questions to provide full accounting of what transpired.

Here is an excerpt, then, from the inspector general's unclassified report on the Clinton investigation:

"Although the Midyear team [that happens to be the code word for the Clinton investigation] drafted a memorandum to the Deputy Attorney General late May 2016 stating that review of the highly classified material was necessary to complete the investigation and requesting permission to access them, the FBI never sent this request to the Department."

So this tells us four things. One, the FBI apparently was aware of highly classified information potentially relevant to the Clinton investigation in its possession; secondly, that the FBI drafted a memo in May of 2016 to get access to the information; three, that memo said review of the information

was necessary to complete the investigation; and fourth, the fact that the memo was never sent.

So, with great emphasis, how could the Obama administration's FBI finish the investigation if they never got access to all potentially relevant information?

Now, there ought to be great Democratic outrage at that apparent failure, and there doesn't seem to be. Will Democrats ask the Justice Department for all underlying information relating to Hillary Clinton's investigation?

Then there is another example. What about the case called Uranium One? I have been pushing for years for more answers about this transaction that allowed the Russian Government to acquire U.S. uranium assets. I have received classified as well as unclassified briefings about this matter.

My staff recently went to FBI headquarters to review additional classified material, and I have identified some FBI intelligence reports that may shed more light on the Uranium One transaction. However, the Attorney General has refused to provide access to those other documents.

Well, if the Democrats demand intelligence-related information from the Justice Department regarding the Mueller report, there should be no reason whatsoever why they shouldn't do the same for Uranium One.

The American people rightly ought to expect something as simple as consistency. If you aren't consistent with what you ask for, then you will not have any credibility.

My attitude and approach is straightforward and nonpartisan. Let's see it all—Russia, Clinton, Uranium One, all of it. As I said on April 8, sunlight is the best disinfectant.

As we listen to and watch tomorrow's testimony going on in the House of Representatives, with Mueller coming back to tell us probably nothing new because he said he isn't going to say anything that isn't already in the 448-page report, let's keep that in mind. Let's see all of it—Russia, Clinton, Uranium One, as well as anything the Democrats are asking for in regard to the Mueller report.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

9/11 VICTIM COMPENSATION FUND

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, for every American who is old enough to remember, the attacks of September 11, 2001, can be recalled as if they happened yesterday. It is one of those rare, almost generational moments that stand in the forefront of our Nation's collective memory. I am confident that if we lined up all 100 Members of the Senate and asked them where they were that morning, they could tell you.

I was in Austin, at home, on the telephone talking to then-Governor Perry, now the Secretary of Energy. My wife got my attention and said: Hold on. You are going to want to see this.

I turned to look at the television just as the second airplane hit the World Trade Center. I don't have to tell you; we all remember the heartbreak, confusion, and anger that welled up in all of us as we saw those images.

In the days and months and years since the attack, we vowed as a nation to "never forget" the events of September 11. I think that is one of the pivotal moments in our Nation's history. We will never forget the 3,000 lives that were lost that day, the loved ones they left behind, or the courage demonstrated by the brave first responders who came from across the country to help in the aftermath of those horrific attacks.

Today, Members of the Senate had an opportunity to vote on legislation to turn that promise to "never forget" into something tangible. I am proud that we have now permanently authorized the 9/11 Victim Compensation Fund. This fund was created to support those who answered the Nation's call to help on 9/11 and in the months that followed that attack.

Now, nearly 18 years later, first responders from across the country are being diagnosed with cancers, respiratory diseases, and other illnesses because of their dangerous work on that day. For them, each day serves as a tragic reminder of the heartbreaking images most of us just witnessed on a television screen.

The legislation we passed today is the Never Forget the Heroes: Permanent Authorization of the 9/11 Victim Compensation Fund Act. As the name suggests, it permanently authorizes funding to support those American heroes who led lifesaving recovery operations following the attacks on 9/11. As I suggested, many of the diseases that affect these men and women, such as cancers and respiratory diseases, may not have become apparent for years after 9/11. It is the nature of these diseases.

Ensuring the longevity of this fund is critical to providing these heroes with the resources they need, whether that life-changing diagnosis comes today or 50 years from now. It is part of our commitment as Americans to support our first responders and the heroes who ran not away from but toward the danger on that fateful day.

Throughout my time in the Senate, I have worked to support our first responders who were there for our communities during the most difficult times. The 9/11 first responders represent the very best of America, and they deserve every ounce of assistance we are able to provide.

This legislation received 402 votes in the House of Representatives and 97 votes here in the Senate, something nearly unheard of these days. I appreciate our colleagues who have been

working to get this legislation passed to provide these men and women with some peace of mind. I am proud to be one of the cosponsors, and I am now glad it is headed to the President's desk for his signature.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG COSTS

Madam President, a survey last summer found that many Texans are struggling to afford the rising cost of their healthcare. Three out of five surveyed reported forgoing or postponing care because of the cost barrier. That includes cutting their pills in half, skipping doses, or not filling a prescription because they simply couldn't afford to do so. With healthcare costs on the rise, things aren't expected to get any easier unless we do something about it.

The Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services estimated that between 2018 and 2027, customers can expect to see prescription drug spending increase by an average of 6.1 percent a year. That is a faster increase than hospital stays, doctors' visits, or any other healthcare expenditure. There seems to be bipartisan agreement that something must be done. But the real question is what that something is: What are your ideas about how to make that something a reality?

Many of our progressive Democratic friends have embraced Medicare for All as the solution to the problems that exist in our healthcare delivery system. Their proposal, though, would kick about 180 million Americans off of their private insurance and force them into one big government-run plan. It would drain the vital program that seniors have relied upon for more than a century and replace it with a watered-down version that would result in long waiting lines for inferior care. The government would tell you what clinic you had to go to, what doctor you could see, and what prescriptions you could actually take. You would lose your freedom and power to decide what is best for you and your family when it comes to your healthcare. You would have to simply take what you could get on somebody else's schedule.

Last but not least, Medicare for All would completely bankrupt our country. I think this approach is akin to having a pipe burst in your house, but instead of repairing it, tearing the whole thing down and rebuilding it from scratch. It is unaffordable. It is unpopular. It is unnecessary and goes against all logic.

Don't get me wrong. Our healthcare system is not perfect, but Medicare for All is actually worse, and it would create more problems than it would solve.

Instead, I support targeted reforms that have been offered by a number of our colleagues here—most on a bipartisan basis—to lower healthcare costs and to give people more choices in terms of what fits their needs the best. On Thursday, the Senate Finance Committee will be marking up a package of bills that will aim to reduce prescription drug costs for seniors and families. Last month, the Senate HELP Com-

mittee overwhelmingly passed a bipartisan bill to reduce out-of-pocket healthcare costs and increase transparency and eliminate surprise medical bills. A few weeks ago, the Senate Judiciary Committee, on which I serve, unanimously reported out legislation that would keep pharmaceutical companies from gaming the patent system.

All of these reforms are intended to repair the problems that exist without completely leveling the existing healthcare system. For example, the package that passed the Judiciary Committee included a proposal I introduced with our colleague from Connecticut, Senator BLUMENTHAL, called the Affordable Prescriptions for Patients Act. This bill takes aim at two practices often deployed by pharmaceutical companies to stomp out competition and protect their bottom line.

First, this bill targets a practice called product hopping. When a company is about to lose exclusivity of a product—that is, when their patent is about ready to run out—they often develop some sort of minor reformulation and then yank the original patented drug off the market. That prevents generic competition. There is no doubt that legitimate changes have warranted a new patent, but, too frequently, we are seeing this deployed as a strategy to box out generic competition.

About 90 percent of the drugs we all take are generic and not branded drugs under a patent. That means we get less expensive drugs that are just as effective as the original branded product. That is the way our system is supposed to work, by making generic drugs more readily available and affordable. By defining product hopping as anti-competitive behavior, the Federal Trade Commission would be able to take action against those who engage in this practice.

Our bill would also target something known as patent thicketing by limiting the patents companies can use to keep competitors away. Some drug companies like to layer on patent after patent in an attempt to make it virtually impossible for biosimilar manufacturers to bring a competing product to market. While the patent on the actual drug formula may have expired, there are still, in some cases, hundreds of other patents to sort through that discourage competition.

This bill would limit the number of patents these companies can use and streamline the litigation process so that companies are spending less time in the courtroom and, hopefully, more time in the laboratory developing life-saving innovative drugs. Competitors would be able to resolve patent disputes faster and bring their drugs to market sooner. Of course, better competition means better prices for patients.

It is also good news for taxpayers. Just last week, we received the cost estimate of this bill from the Congressional Budget Office, and they found it

would lower Federal spending by more than one-half billion dollars over 10 years. This is just the savings to the Federal Government under Medicare and Medicaid. There would undoubtedly be additional significant savings for consumers with private health insurance.

The Affordable Prescriptions for Patients Act does not prevent manufacturers from making improvements to their products, and it doesn't limit patent rights. It also doesn't hamper innovation, and it doesn't spend money we don't have on a system we don't really want. It simply stops those who knowingly game and abuse our patent system.

Our country is proudly a leader in pharmaceutical innovation, partly because we offer robust protection for intellectual property. When you create a new drug, you are granted a patent, an exclusive right to sell that drug for a period of years. But this legislation ensures that those who game the system—the bad actors—are no longer able to take advantage of these innovation protections in order to maintain their monopolies at the expense of the American people after their patent should have expired.

I believe there is more we can do to improve our healthcare system and bring down out-of-pocket costs for the American people, but instead of tearing down the whole house, let's make the repairs we actually need.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, the postcloture time on the Dickson nomination expire at 11 a.m. on Wednesday, July 24; further, that following the disposition of the Dickson nomination, the Senate vote on the cloture motions for the Berger and Buescher nominations; finally, that if cloture is invoked, the Senate vote on the confirmations of those nominations in the order listed at 3 p.m. and, if any of the nominations are confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid on the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session and be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF ELIZABETH DARLING

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, today I am lifting my hold on the nomination

of Elizabeth Darling to be Commissioner on Children, Youth, and Families at the Department of Health and Human Services.

I will not object to any unanimous consent request concerning the nomination of Ms. Darling at this time. Please remove my hold from the back of the Executive Calendar in the section titled Notice of Intent to Object.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO STEVE ANTOLINE

• Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, it is an honor to recognize the legacy of Steve Antoline as fearless leader in business, a dedicated philanthropist, and a proud West Virginian who has made substantial contributions to our home State.

One of the greatest milestones we achieved when I was West Virginia's Governor was when the Boy Scouts of America committed to bringing a world-class scouting facility to the Mountain State, and Steve was a vital part of that process. Today, the Summit Bechtel Reserve is homebase every 4 years for tens of thousands of Boy Scouts from across the country. I assembled government officials, business leaders, and private volunteers into what I called the West Virginia Project Arrow Task Force in order to convince the National Executive Board of the Boy Scouts of America of what we already knew—that the ideal place for this facility was in the adventurous terrains and magnificent mountains of West Virginia. The Boy Scouts and West Virginia truly are a perfect match—an organization that builds character, inspires reverences, and promotes the values of hard work and compassion, and a State whose people live and breathe those values every day.

Steve was able to create and manage so many wonderful programs through the camp. He worked on the Reaching the Summit Boy Scout Community Service Initiative, organizing and garnering support for more than 34 projects that utilized countless hours of community service for Nicholas County. Also in Nicholas County, he serves as the chairman of the Young Life Wild Ridge Camp Executive Committee and also as a sponsor of the Young Life organization for the county. With Steve's input, Young Life is currently in the early stages of building the Wild Ridge Camp, which will host more than 22,000 children per year, providing educational opportunities to develop leadership skills, civic responsibility, and moral values.

As one of the founding fathers of the Summit Bechtel Reserve Scout Camp, I cannot think of a more fitting tribute to his legacy than the Steve Antoline Family Conservation Center and Trail. The coal from that property helped build the Panama Canal. The timber that from that property helped build

the boats that helped win WWII. It has so much historical value, and now it builds the tallest timber—our future leaders. And as Scouts walk by the newly dedicated bronze tribute in honor of Steve's legacy, it is my hope they are inspired by the man who has surrounded them with opportunities here in West Virginia.

The Conservation Center will offer hands-on exhibits, projects, and a laboratory for Scouts and youth to further understand and promote conservation efforts. This project is being designed and built by Steve, along with collaborative efforts from the Boy Scouts of America and West Virginia University.

Beyond the camp, Steve has contributed greatly to the surrounding region. He has founded and operated various companies that include operations in natural gas, production, excavation, contracting, property development and biosciences research companies. Among his many accomplishments for West Virginia is Superior Highwall Miners, Inc., a business based in Beckley that grew into the world's largest manufacturer of highwall mining equipment. His efforts brought in countless jobs and showcased West Virginia's vast potential across the globe.

Steve serves as cochairman of the new WVU Children's Hospital Building Campaign and also serves on the hospital's advisory board. He is the owner of New River Labs, LLC and KEM Research Group, LLC, a cancer research company performing state-of-the-art diagnostic services for esophageal, cervical, melanoma, pancreatic, prostate, and many other forms of cancer. At Summit Resources, Inc., Steve serves as owner and president, specializing on excavation, land management, and investment. Other organizations he has been involved with include the Remember the Miners Organization, the Norma Mae Huggins Cancer Research Foundation, Summersville Youth Athletics, Raleigh County, YMCA, Beckley Chamber of Commerce, and the Fayette and Nicholas County chapter of the American Red Cross.

Put simply, Steve is a West Virginian, through and through. He knows our communities inside and out and has strived throughout his endeavors to give back to the people of West Virginia, particularly to our future leaders. He has a passion for providing our State's youth with every opportunity possible to achieve success. With thanks to his efforts at Summit Bechtel and beyond, countless opportunities have been created and will continue to come to fruition in the days and years ahead.

I wish the very best for Steve and his family: his wife, Jamie; his children, Emily, Madison, and Kristopher; and his grandchildren Nina and Hunter. I am honored to join them and all West Virginians in celebrating Steve's lifelong commitment to excellence in the Mountain State.●

RECOGNIZING CHEMTRACK ALASKA

• Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, this week, I have the opportunity to introduce the U.S. Senate Small Business of the Week. Small businesses provide essential services to our Nation's communities. In my home State of Alaska, I have seen firsthand small businesses that contribute to the local economy and step in when a community is in need. It is my honor to name ChemTrack Alaska of Anchorage, AK, as the Senate Small Business of the Week.

ChemTrack was founded as a construction company by Sig Jokiel in 1973. Shortly after its inception, the company shifted focus and rebranded itself into an environmental services and engineering company when Chuck Ronan joined the team in 1985. After studying business at the University of New Hampshire, Sig's daughter, Carrie, joined the company in 2002. Carrie, who became the company's majority partner in 2010, brought business expertise and project management skills to ChemTrack. Throughout the company's 46-year history, it has contracted with the U.S. Air Force, Alaska Railroad Corporation, Bureau of Indian Affairs, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, BP, Exxon, and many other government institutions and businesses. In 2019, ChemTrack was awarded the Women-Owned Small Business of the Year Award by the SBA in recognition of its outstanding achievements.

ChemTrack's commitment to developing creative environmental engineering solutions enables the company to contribute to local projects in Alaska's great outdoors. As a successful contractor and a certified 8(a) economically disadvantaged woman-owned small business, ChemTrack has completed projects for both private businesses and government clients. ChemTrack helped clean up Alaska's shorelines after the Exxon Valdez oil spill in 1989 by developing innovative, barge-mounted sweeps to clean sea water. As a testament to ChemTrack's environmental stewardship, the company was awarded a basic ordering agreement by the U.S. Coast Guard in 2012, enabling them to provide containment cleanup and mitigate the harmful effects of oil spills and hazardous substance incidents all over the state of Alaska.

Carrie is renowned as an advocate for small businesses at both the Federal and State level. During her testimony in front of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship in June 2018, Carrie discussed the SBA's contracting programs and provided insight on her experience operating a woman-owned small business. As a graduate of the SBA Emerging Leaders program, Carrie is very active in her community and even mentors other Alaskan businesses through the Women's Power League of Alaska. Carrie's distinction as a local leader is evidenced by her inclusion in the Alaska

Journal of Commerce's Top 40 Under 40 list of 2014 and her selection as the 2018 Entprising Women of the Year Award.

Back home in Alaska, Carrie serves on the Associated General Contractors board of directors, as well as the Boards for Women Impacting Public Policy and the Alaska State Hockey Association. She also completed a 6-year term with YWCA, where she served as president for 2 years, and is a member of the Society of American Military Engineers and National Contracting Management Association. Carrie's abilities as an athlete complement her business skills. She was inducted into the Sports Hall of Fame at the University of New Hampshire in 2014 and served as an Ambassador for Women's Ice Hockey in Fast and Female International Program.

ChemTrack has successfully pursued a two-pronged mission of profit and stewardship. By employing its engineering proficiency to aid in disaster recovery, ChemTrack has shown us what can be achieved when individuals and businesses apply their specific skills to help better their community.

ChemTrack has grown from a small construction company to a successful environmental engineering contractor with a clear track record of community involvement. I am honored to recognize Carrie and the entire team at ChemTrack Alaska as the Senate Small Business of the Week, and I look forward to watching your continued growth and success.●

TRIBUTE TO MAHLON PAUL MANSON

● Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I rise today to honor Mahlon Paul Manson, a Montanan and decorated veteran of the Vietnam war.

Montanans and all Americans owe Paul the deepest gratitude for his service to this Nation.

Paul was born in San Diego, CA, on September 17, 1948. When he was in first grade, his mother and three sisters moved to Deer Lodge, MT, where he spent his youth. Paul completed high school in 1967 and enlisted in the Army immediately following graduation.

During the summer of 1967, Paul worked for the Forest Service shortly before starting military training at Fort Lewis, WA. He also received advanced training to be a combat engineer at Fort Leonard Wood, MO.

Before leaving for Vietnam, Paul returned home for 2 weeks where he got a glimpse into the strength of shared ideals. When he landed at the airport, his bus was not scheduled to arrive for 6 more hours. Not one to wait idly by, Paul decided to try his luck hitchhiking home.

In a moment of serendipity and brotherhood, a military car driving by saw Paul walking along the side of the road in his uniform, offered to give him a ride, and drove him home. This mo-

ment left a deep and lasting impact on Paul, who felt an instant bond with his fellow servicemembers.

Paul arrived in Vietnam in early 1968 with this sentiment in mind. That year, he fought—and survived—a number of attacks, including one of the largest military campaigns of the Vietnam war, the Tet Offensive.

He also showed incredible courage when his convoy came under attack near Lai Khe. While heavily engaged with the enemy, Paul put his own life on the line by jumping out of his military vehicle to encourage the convoy to keep moving. His heroic act helped the U.S. facilitate a counterattack against the Viet Cong, ultimately clinching an important victory. Paul's heroism did not go without recognition—he received a Bronze Star, with a "V" for Valor on August 20, 1968 for his leadership.

After retiring from Active Duty in 1970, Paul returned to Montana to work for the Milwaukee Railroad. He also continued his devotion to service by becoming a recruiter for the Montana National Guard.

When he retired from the Army, Paul attended the University of Montana. He graduated in 1996 and began working for U.S. Customs and Border Protection in Missoula and Sweet Grass and in Washington State as a Port Director. In total, Paul has given the Nation over 20 years of Federal Service and continues to serve the Nation in a different capacity today, as a volunteer for Team Rubicon.

Paul and his wife, Fran, have been happily married for 48 years. Together, they have a son, Mahlon Patrick, and a daughter, Michelle, as well as two grandchildren.

Although Paul has undeniably led an eventful life, he humbly maintains that he is simply doing his job. "Life is a buffet" he says, a perfect idiom for how he is able to make the most of the opportunities that come his way.

I have the profound honor of presenting Paul with his military honor. For his bravery in the line of duty, Mahlon Paul Manson is receiving a Bronze Star Medal with a "V" for Valor. This medal serves as a small token of our country's appreciation for his service and profound sacrifice. Paul is an American hero and has made Montana proud.●

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Ms. Roberts, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting a nomination which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(The message received today is printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:02 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that pursuant to 29 U.S.C. 780, the Minority Leader appoints the following member to the National Council on Disability: Mr. Jim Baldwin of Bakersfield, California.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BARRASSO, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works:

Report to accompany S. 349, a bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to request nominations for, and make determinations regarding, roads to be designated under the national scenic byways program, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 116-61).

Report to accompany S. 1014, a bill to establish the Route 66 Centennial Commission, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 116-62).

Report to accompany S. 1689, a bill to permit States to transfer certain funds from the clean water revolving fund of a State to the drinking water revolving fund of the State in certain circumstances, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 116-63).

Report to accompany S. 1833, a bill to transfer a bridge over the Wabash River to the New Harmony River Bridge Authority and the New Harmony and Wabash River Bridge Authority, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 116-64).

By Mr. GRAHAM, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1883. A bill to improve the prohibitions on money laundering, and for other purposes.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. BLUNT (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. GARDNER, and Ms. CORTEZ MASTO):

S. 2203. A bill to extend the transfer of Electronic Travel Authorization System fees from the Travel Promotion Fund to the Corporation for Travel Promotion (Brand USA) through fiscal year 2027, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CRAPO (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 2204. A bill to allow the Federal Communications Commission to carry out a pilot program under which voice service providers could block certain automated calls, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. KAINE, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 2205. A bill to ensure that claims for benefits under the Black Lung Benefits Act are processed in a fair and timely manner, to better protect miners from pneumoconiosis (commonly known as "black lung disease"), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. TILLIS (for himself and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 2206. A bill to express the sense of Congress regarding restoration and maintenance of the Mardasson Memorial in Bastogne, Belgium; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. HASSAN (for herself and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 2207. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand refundability and increase simplification of the research credit for certain small businesses; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida:

S. 2208. A bill to require online retailers to prominently disclose product country-of-origin information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. HYDE-SMITH (for herself and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 2209. A bill to amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to establish a safety net program for commercial fishermen and aquaculture producers; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 2210. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to prohibit sewage dumping into the Great Lakes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. MANCHIN:

S. 2211. A bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to authorize the expansion of the Appalachian development highway system; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 2212. A bill to require the Commandant of the Coast Guard to take certain steps to improve Coast Guard shore infrastructure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. GARDNER (for himself and Mr. BENNET):

S. 2213. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to repay the credit risk premiums paid with respect to certain railroad infrastructure loans after the obligations attached to such loans have been satisfied; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 2214. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a better defined recruitment and retention incentive program for volunteer emergency service workers; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Ms. WARREN):

S. 2215. A bill to prohibit agreements between employers that directly restrict the current or future employment of any employee; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

S. 2216. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to formally recognize caregivers of veterans, notify veterans and caregivers of clinical determinations relating to eligibility for caregiver programs, and temporarily extend benefits for veterans who are determined ineligible for the family caregiver program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CASEY:

S. 2217. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide that over-the-road bus drivers are covered under the maximum hours requirements; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 2218. A bill to amend title IV of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 to restore Medicaid coverage for citizens of the Freely As-

sociated States lawfully residing in the United States under the Compacts of Free Association between the Government of the United States and the Governments of the Federated States of Micronesia, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, and the Republic of Palau; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. HARRIS (for herself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. WARREN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 2219. A bill to clarify the rights of all persons who are held or detained at a port of entry or at any detention facility overseen by U.S. Customs and Border Protection or U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. CORNYN, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 2220. A bill to modify the exemption for trade secrets and commercial or financial information in the Freedom of Information Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. HARRIS:

S. 2221. A bill to prohibit the expansion of immigration detention facilities, to improve the oversight of such facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. BRAUN:

S. 2222. A bill to prohibit the Export-Import Bank of the United States from providing financing to persons with seriously delinquent tax debt; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. RUBIO, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. DAINES):

S. 2223. A bill to facilitate a national pipeline of spectrum for commercial use, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Mr. CRUZ):

S. 2224. A bill to amend section 214(c)(8) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to modify the data reporting requirements relating to nonimmigrant employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. HARRIS (for herself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 2225. A bill to provide for the basic needs of students at institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. SMITH, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 2226. A bill to require States to carry out congressional redistricting in accordance with plans developed and enacted into law by independent redistricting commissions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. HARRIS (for herself, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WYDEN, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 2227. A bill to decriminalize and deschedule cannabis, to provide for reinvestment in certain persons adversely impacted by the War on Drugs, to provide for expungement of certain cannabis offenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CORNYN, and Mr. CRUZ):

S. 2228. A bill to posthumously advance Lieutenant Colonel Richard E. Cole, United States Air Force, to colonel on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DAINES (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 2229. A bill to protect consumers from deceptive practices with respect to online booking of hotel reservations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. MURPHY:

S. 2230. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the dollar limitation on the exclusion for employer-provided dependent care assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BOOKER:

S. 2231. A bill to establish American opportunity accounts, to modify estate and gift tax rules, to reform the taxation of capital income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR:

S. 2232. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to reduce the number of members of the Federal Election Commission from 6 to 5, to revise the method of selection and terms of service of members of the Commission, to distribute the powers of the Commission between the Chair and the remaining members, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. REED, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. KAINES, Mr. BENNET, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. HIRONO, and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. 2233. A bill to nullify the effect of the recent executive order that requires Federal agencies to share citizenship data; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. ROUNDS (for himself and Mr. PETERS):

S. 2234. A bill to establish a consortia of universities to advise the Secretary of Defense on cybersecurity matters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. WARREN:

S. 2235. A bill to discharge the qualified loan amounts of each individual, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. SCHATZ, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. 2236. A bill to require Federal agencies to address environmental justice, to require consideration of cumulative impacts in certain permitting decisions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 2237. A bill to authorize the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission to seek civil monetary penalties to deter violations of section 2 of the Sherman Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 2238. A bill to protect elections for public office by providing financial support and enhanced security for the infrastructure used to carry out such elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR:

S. 2239. A bill to codify an Executive order preparing the United States for the impacts of climate change, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. BENNET, Ms. SMITH, and Mr. PETERS):

S. 2240. A bill to promote digital citizenship and media literacy; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. HEINRICH (for himself and Ms. MCSALLY):

S. 2241. A bill to provide for a study on the protection of Native American seeds and traditional foods, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. REED, Mr. KING, Mr. BENNET, and Ms. HARRIS):

S. 2242. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to clarify the obligation to report acts of foreign election influence and require implementation of compliance and reporting systems by presidential campaigns to detect and report such acts; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. LEE, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. SASSE, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. ERNST, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

S. Res. 280. A resolution commending the officers and personnel of U.S. Customs and Border Protection for their work during the crisis at the Southern border; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Ms. HARRIS):

S. Res. 281. A resolution committing to elevate the voices, leadership, and needs of communities that face systemic barriers in the effort to end sexual violence and support all survivors of sexual violence and gender-based violence, including immigrant survivors, survivors who are incarcerated, survivors with disabilities, survivors of color, American Indian or Alaska Native survivors, survivors of child sexual abuse, and lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, and intersex survivors; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. GRAHAM, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURR, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CASSIDY, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Mr. ENZI, Ms. ERNST, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. GARDNER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. JONES, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEE, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. REED, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROMNEY, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SASSE, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr.

SHELBY, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. SMITH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. Res. 282. A resolution honoring former Associate Justice John Paul Stevens of the Supreme Court of the United States; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 102

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 102, a bill to significantly lower prescription drug prices for patients in the United States by ending government-granted monopolies for manufacturers who charge drug prices that are higher than the median prices at which the drugs are available in other countries.

S. 157

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 157, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit kindergarten through grade 12 educational expenses to be paid from a 529 account.

S. 265

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 265, a bill to develop a national strategy to prevent targeted violence through behavioral threat assessment and management, and for other purposes.

S. 283

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 283, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to, and utilization of, bone mass measurement benefits under part B of the Medicare program by establishing a minimum payment amount under such part for bone mass measurement.

S. 331

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 331, a bill to amend the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act of 1975 to modify the exemptions from certain disclosure requirements.

S. 430

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) were added as cosponsors of S. 430, a bill to extend the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000.

S. 473

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 473, a bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to include certain Federal positions within the definition of law enforcement officer for retirement purposes, and for other purposes.

S. 481

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 481, a bill to encourage States to require the installation of residential carbon monoxide detectors in homes, and for other purposes.

S. 518

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 518, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for Medicare coverage of certain lymphedema compression treatment items as items of durable medical equipment.

S. 524

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 524, a bill to establish the Department of Veterans Affairs Advisory Committee on Tribal and Indian Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 546

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 546, a bill to extend authorization for the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001 through fiscal year 2090, and for other purposes.

S. 569

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 569, a bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to issue regulations relating to commercial motor vehicle drivers under the age of 21, and for other purposes.

S. 595

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 595, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coordination of programs to prevent and treat obesity, and for other purposes.

S. 638

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 638, a bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to designate per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances as hazardous substances under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, Liability Act of 1980, and for other purposes.

S. 803

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 803, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to restore incentives for investments in qualified improvement property.

S. 814

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 814, a bill to amend title XVIII of

the Social Security Act to improve access to diabetes outpatient self-management training services, and for other purposes.

S. 921

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 921, a bill to prohibit the use of chlorpyrifos on food, to prohibit the registration of pesticides containing chlorpyrifos, and for other purposes.

S. 976

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 976, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 and the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act to combat campus sexual assault, and for other purposes.

S. 997

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 997, a bill to recognize and honor the service of individuals who served in the United States Cadet Nurse Corps during World War II, and for other purposes.

S. 1039

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1039, a bill to limit the use of funds for kinetic military operations in or against Iran.

S. 1086

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1086, a bill to establish certain duties for pharmacies to ensure provision of Food and Drug Administration-approved contraception, medication related to contraception, and for other purposes.

S. 1102

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1102, a bill to promote security and energy partnerships in the Eastern Mediterranean, and for other purposes.

S. 1141

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1141, a bill to provide predictability and certainty in the tax law, create jobs, and encourage investment.

S. 1168

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1168, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to ensure campus access at public institutions of higher education for religious groups.

S. 1191

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor

of S. 1191, a bill to reauthorize section 340H of the Public Health Service Act to continue to encourage the expansion, maintenance, and establishment of approved graduate medical residency programs at qualified teaching health centers, and for other purposes.

S. 1243

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1243, a bill to provide standards for facilities at which aliens in the custody of the Department of Homeland Security are detained, and for other purposes.

S. 1253

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1253, a bill to apply requirements relating to delivery sales of cigarettes to delivery sales of electronic nicotine delivery systems, and for other purposes.

S. 1254

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1254, a bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to review and report on certain laws, safety measures, and technologies relating to the illegal passing of school buses, and for other purposes.

S. 1499

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1499, a bill to establish National Wildlife Corridors to provide for the protection and restoration of certain native fish, wildlife, and plant species, and for other purposes.

S. 1528

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1528, a bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to provide for the issuance of Green Bonds and to establish the United States Green Bank, and for other purposes.

S. 1572

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1572, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require additional reporting on crime and harm that occurs during student participation in programs of study abroad, and for other purposes.

S. 1575

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1575, a bill to direct the Secretary of State to make available to the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention copies of consular reports of death of United States citizens, and for other purposes.

S. 1590

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island

(Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1590, a bill to amend the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 to authorize rewards for thwarting wildlife trafficking linked to transnational organized crime, and for other purposes.

S. 1625

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1625, a bill to promote the deployment of commercial fifth-generation mobile networks and the sharing of information with communications providers in the United States regarding security risks to the networks of those providers, and for other purposes.

S. 1728

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) and the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1728, a bill to require the United States Postal Service to sell the Alzheimer's semipostal stamp for 6 additional years.

S. 1737

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors of S. 1737, a bill to strengthen parity in mental health and substance use disorder benefits.

S. 1773

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1773, a bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to make improvements to the treatment of the United States territories under the Medicare and Medicaid programs, and for other purposes.

S. 1822

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER), the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1822, a bill to require the Federal Communications Commission to issue rules relating to the collection of data with respect to the availability of broadband services, and for other purposes.

S. 1863

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1863, a bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of the sites associated with the life and legacy of the noted American philanthropist and business executive Julius Rosenwald, with a special focus on the Rosenwald Schools, and for other purposes.

S. 1906

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Ms.

ROSEN) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) were added as cosponsors of S. 1906, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide financial assistance to eligible entities to provide and coordinate the provision of suicide prevention services for veterans at risk of suicide and veteran families through the award of grants to such entities, and for other purposes.

S. 1918

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1918, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to require alternative options for summer food service program delivery.

S. 1936

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1936, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to protect coverage for screening mammography, and for other purposes.

S. 2041

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2041, a bill to establish the Green Spaces, Green Vehicles Initiative to facilitate the installation of zero-emissions vehicle infrastructure on National Forest System land, National Park System land, and certain related land, and for other purposes.

S. 2043

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2043, a bill to provide incentives for hate crime reporting, provide grants for State-run hate crime hotlines, and establish alternative sentencing for individuals convicted under the Matthew Shephard and James Byrd, Jr. Hate Crimes Prevention Act.

S. 2068

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the names of the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors of S. 2068, a bill to prohibit the Bureau of the Census from including citizenship data in the legislative redistricting data prepared by the Bureau.

S. 2072

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2072, a bill to provide for an increase, effective December 1, 2019, in the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 2080

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the names of the Senator from Wyoming

(Mr. BARRASSO) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) were added as cosponsors of S. 2080, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the number of permanent faculty in palliative care at accredited allopathic and osteopathic medical schools, nursing schools, social work schools, and other programs, including physician assistant education programs, to promote education and research in palliative care and hospice, and to support the development of faculty careers in academic palliative medicine.

S. 2103

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2103, a bill to improve access to affordable insulin.

S. 2112

At the request of Ms. HARRIS, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2112, a bill to enhance the rights of domestic workers, and for other purposes.

S. 2147

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2147, a bill to double the existing penalties for the provision of misleading or inaccurate caller identification information, and to extend the statute of limitations for forfeiture penalties for persons who commit such violations.

S. 2165

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2165, a bill to enhance protections of Native American tangible cultural heritage, and for other purposes.

S. 2179

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of S. 2179, a bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to provide social service agencies with the resources to provide services to meet the urgent needs of Holocaust survivors to age in place with dignity, comfort, security, and quality of life.

S. 2185

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2185, a bill to provide labor standards for certain energy jobs, and for other purposes.

S. 2193

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2193, a bill to require the Administrator of General Services to issue guidance to clarify that Federal agencies may pay by charge card for the charging of Federal electric motor vehicles, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 80

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 80, a resolution establishing the John S. McCain III Human Rights Commission.

S. RES. 252

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 252, a resolution designating September 2019 as National Democracy Month as a time to reflect on the contributions of the system of government of the United States to a more free and stable world.

S. RES. 263

At the request of Mr. BRAUN, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN), the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA), the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST) and the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 263, a resolution honoring the 100th anniversary of The American Legion.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 2214. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a better defined recruitment and retention incentive program for volunteer emergency service workers; to the Committee on Finance.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise to introduce a bill with my friend and colleague from Maryland, Senator CARDIN, that will benefit the brave women and men who volunteer as emergency personnel: The Volunteer Emergency Services Recruitment and Retention Act.

Across our Nation, volunteer emergency personnel play a critical role in ensuring the safety of our communities and the well-being of our neighbors. They serve as the firefighters, EMS, and other first responders that we depend on in our times of need. The State of Maine, for example, has approximately 9,785 firefighters who serve the State's 1.3 million citizens. Maine is largely a rural State, and more than 90 percent of firefighters are volunteers. Without these dedicated volunteers, many smaller communities would be unable to provide firefighting and other emergency services at all.

Often, communities seek to recruit and retain volunteers by offering modest benefits. One of the most common benefits are Length of Service Award Programs or LOSAPs. These are retirement accounts provided to volunteer emergency responders. The legislation we are introducing today would support these efforts by helping to ensure that these nominal benefits to volunteers are not entangled in bureaucracy or needlessly held back by regulations. Specifically, the Volunteer Emergency Services Recruitment and Retention

Act would simplify how LOSAPs are taxed without increasing or reducing Federal spending or taxes. It would do this by eliminating burdensome and confusing IRS requirements that make it unnecessarily difficult for volunteer emergency personnel to receive benefits and for departments to administer plans.

Mr. President, we should take care to protect our volunteer emergency personnel who serve this country with such bravery. Our legislation would help us achieve that goal, and I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting this bill.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 280—COMMENDING THE OFFICERS AND PERSONNEL OF U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION FOR THEIR WORK DURING THE CRISIS AT THE SOUTHERN BORDER

Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. LEE, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. SASSE, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. ERNST, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mrs. BLACKBURN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs:

S. RES. 280

Whereas U.S. Customs and Border Protection (referred to in this preamble as “CBP”) is charged with protecting the borders of the United States and facilitating travel and trade;

Whereas the Southern border of the United States is experiencing unprecedented numbers of vulnerable individuals attempting to enter the country;

Whereas, in June 2019, 104,344 individuals were apprehended at the Southern border, which is an increase of more than 140 percent, as compared to June 2018;

Whereas, as of June 2019, the number of individuals apprehended or determined to be inadmissible by CBP at the Southern border in fiscal year 2019 is 780,638, already surpassing the fiscal year 2014 total of 569,287, which was the highest such number in the preceding 5 years;

Whereas the Homeland Security Advisory Council expects Southwest border migration numbers to approach or exceed 1,000,000 individuals in fiscal year 2019 unless immediate action is taken;

Whereas, historically, the majority of individuals arriving at the Southern border have been single adult males from Mexico, but by May 2019, 72 percent of all border enforcement actions were associated with unaccompanied children and family units;

Whereas, due to the constant and increasing flow of migrants crossing the Southern border between ports of entry, financial and human resources are being diverted from the security and law enforcement duties of CBP, resulting in—

(1) fewer seizures of narcotics and illicit currency; and

(2) increased wait times at ports of entry, leading to warnings of possible produce shortages and interruptions in supply chains;

Whereas more than 40 percent of CBP resources are currently being absorbed by the humanitarian crisis at the Southern border;

Whereas the final emergency interim report published by the Homeland Security Ad-

visory Council on April 16, 2019, notes that a substantial number of individuals who are apprehended by CBP require significant personal and medical care that exceeds the ability and capacity of CBP, despite creative and humane attempts by CBP to care for such individuals in CBP custody;

Whereas CBP officers and personnel have raised concerns that overcrowding poses immediate risks to—

(1) the health and safety of the migrants; and

(2) CBP officers;

Whereas CBP officers are experiencing both physical illness and severe mental and emotional distress as a result of the crisis at the Southern border;

Whereas, in May 2019, the Commissioner of CBP requested an additional \$2,100,000 for the Employee Assistance Program of CBP in order to offer additional counseling services to CBP officers and personnel to respond to “unanticipated critical incidents and other emerging crises, such as the unexpected response required for migrant caravans, employee suicides, and the need for a financial wellness program”; and

Whereas, in the face of the most difficult circumstances, CBP officers and personnel continue—

(1) to work undaunted to protect the Southern border; and

(2) to care for the migrants in CBP custody; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commends the men and women of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, including Border Patrol personnel, Office of Field Operations personnel, Air and Marine Operations personnel, Office of Trade personnel, and all support personnel and their allies for their continued honorable service during the challenging humanitarian crisis at the Southern border; and

(2) calls on Congress to pass legislation to support U.S. Customs and Border Protection officers and to manage the increasing flow of migrants attempting to enter the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 281—COMMITTING TO ELEVATE THE VOICES, LEADERSHIP, AND NEEDS OF COMMUNITIES THAT FACE SYSTEMIC BARRIERS IN THE EFFORT TO END SEXUAL VIOLENCE AND SUPPORT ALL SURVIVORS OF SEXUAL VIOLENCE AND GENDER-BASED VIOLENCE, INCLUDING IMMIGRANT SURVIVORS, SURVIVORS WHO ARE INCARCERATED, SURVIVORS WITH DISABILITIES, SURVIVORS OF COLOR, AMERICAN INDIAN OR ALASKA NATIVE SURVIVORS, SURVIVORS OF CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE, AND LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL, TRANSGENDER, QUEER, AND INTERSEX SURVIVORS

Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Ms. HARRIS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 281

Whereas sexual violence and gender-based violence are tools of oppression and forms of discrimination that can deprive individuals of equal access to educational opportunities;

Whereas survivors of sexual violence face a significant number of health problems, including chronic conditions, suicide, depression, and post-traumatic stress disorder;

Whereas discrimination on the basis of sex includes discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation, gender identity, sex stereotypes, pregnancy, termination of pregnancy, childbirth, and related medical conditions;

Whereas the 2015 United States Transgender Survey found that—

(1) 47 percent of transgender people have been sexually assaulted; and

(2) among transgender people of color, 65 percent of Native Americans, 59 percent of multiracial people, 58 percent of Middle Eastern people, and 53 percent of African Americans have been sexually assaulted;

Whereas the Association of American Universities Campus Climate Survey on Sexual Assault and Sexual Misconduct found that nearly 1 in 4 transgender, genderqueer, gender non-conforming, or questioning students experience sexual violence while pursuing an undergraduate degree;

Whereas the National Sexual Violence Resource Center found that 78 percent of transgender or gender non-conforming youth are sexually harassed during the period beginning in kindergarten and ending in 12th grade;

Whereas the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention 2010 National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey found that—

(1) 44 percent of lesbian women and 61 percent of bisexual women experience rape, physical violence, or stalking by an intimate partner, compared to 35 percent of heterosexual women; and

(2) 40 percent of gay men and 37 percent of bisexual men have experienced sexual violence other than rape, compared to 21 percent of heterosexual men;

Whereas the National Women’s Law Center 2017 Let Her Learn Survey found that 38 percent of lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender teen girls reported experiencing sexual violence, compared to 21 percent of all girls;

Whereas, according to the Department of Justice, people with disabilities are 3.5 times more likely to experience rape or sexual assault than people without disabilities;

Whereas, according to the Vera Institute of Justice—

(1) children with disabilities are 3 times more likely than children without disabilities to be sexually abused; and

(2) 83 percent of women and 32 percent of men with cognitive disabilities reported being victims of sexual assault;

Whereas women of all races and ethnicities face some risk of sexual assault, and, according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention 2010 National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey, 33 percent of multiracial non-Hispanic women, nearly 27 percent of indigenous women, 22 percent of Black women, nearly 19 percent of White non-Hispanic women, more than 14 percent of Hispanic women, and 7 percent of Asian American and Pacific Islander women in the United States have experienced rape;

Whereas, according to a research report by the National Institute of Justice, 56.1 percent of American Indian and Alaska Native women have experienced sexual violence;

Whereas sexual violence also affects adolescent girls and, according to the National Women’s Law Center 2017 Let Her Learn Survey, 1 in 5 girls aged 14 to 18 has been kissed or touched without consent, including 24 percent of Latina girls, 23 percent of Native American girls, and 22 percent of Black girls;

Whereas studies show that sexual violence and gender-based violence are underreported crimes, indicating that the rates of sexual violence and gender-based violence may be even higher than these estimates;

Whereas too many survivors from communities that face systemic barriers are ignored, blamed, and cast aside when seeking support after experiencing a form of sexual violence or gender-based violence;

Whereas communities that have been disproportionately harmed by the criminal justice system, including Black women and girls, may be less likely to report sexual violence when that violence occurs;

Whereas incarcerated women report extensive histories of emotional, physical, and sexual abuse;

Whereas, according to the Department of Justice, “allegations of sexual misconduct were made in all but one state prison and 41% of local and private jails and prisons”;

Whereas prior abuse is a key predictor of involvement in the juvenile justice system;

Whereas according to the Annie E. Casey Foundation, nearly ¾ of girls in the juvenile justice system have experienced physical or sexual abuse, and many of those girls experience criminal penalties for their responses to sexual violence;

Whereas communities of color are overrepresented in jails and prisons in the United States and disproportionately impacted by violence, including sexual violence, in the criminal justice system;

Whereas youth of color, youth with disabilities, and youth who identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, or gender non-conforming are overrepresented in the child welfare system;

Whereas lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender youth are overrepresented in the youth homeless population, making them particularly at risk for sexual violence;

Whereas the Center for American Progress reports that 22 percent of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender youth have been sexually assaulted or raped, which is more than 3 times the rate of sexual assault and rape among other homeless youth;

Whereas, according to the GLSEN 2016 report entitled “From Teasing to Torment: School Climate Revisited”—

(1) 59.6 percent of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (referred to in this preamble as “LGBTQ”) secondary students have been sexually harassed at school, and LGBTQ students are more likely to experience sexual harassment than non-LGBTQ students; and

(2) students with nontraditional gender expression are more likely to experience sexual harassment than students with traditional gender expression;

Whereas high-quality, medically accurate, and LGBTQ-affirming sex education is critical in the effort to eliminate sexual violence by teaching young people about sexual assault, harassment, and affirmative consent;

Whereas less than 40 percent of all high schools and only 14 percent of middle schools in the United States teach all of the topics identified by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention as important sexual health education topics;

Whereas, according to the National Center for Victims of Crime, a child who is the victim of prolonged sexual abuse usually develops low self-esteem, a feeling of worthlessness, and an abnormal or distorted view of sex;

Whereas, according to the Rape, Abuse & Incest National Network, there is an increased likelihood that an individual will suffer from suicidal or depressive thoughts after experiencing sexual violence;

Whereas, at a time of prioritized mass detention and deportation and the rescinding of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program, it is less safe for immigrants to report sexual violence;

Whereas immigrant children are separated from their families and thousands of those children report sexual abuse in government-funded detention camps;

Whereas a history of systemic inequality and discrimination as well as incomplete solutions has resulted in a lack of resources to

meet the needs of diverse survivor populations;

Whereas, according to the National Alliance to End Sexual Violence—

(1) there is a lack of resources for sexual violence and gender-based violence prevention for youth;

(2) many rape crisis centers have waiting lists for prevention programs; and

(3) more investment is needed in the Rape Prevention and Education Program;

Whereas a 2016 National Consensus Statement of Anti-Sexual Assault and Domestic Violence Organizations in Support of Full and Equal Access for the Transgender Community, signed by over 300 local, State, and national organizations, stated: “As organizations that care about reducing assault and violence, we favor laws and policies that protect transgender people from discrimination, including in accessing facilities that match the gender they live every day.”;

Whereas sexual violence and gender-based violence will only end if—

(1) the experiences and needs of immigrant survivors, survivors who are incarcerated, American Indian or Alaska Native survivors, survivors of child sexual abuse, queer and intersex survivors, and survivors with disabilities are respected and supported; and

(2) those survivors are provided culturally and linguistically appropriate and relevant services and accommodations;

Whereas current support systems mandated by Federal law for survivors of sexual violence are neither comprehensive nor fully representative of the vast and pervasive elements within rape culture; and

Whereas Congress is working to confront pervasive sexual violence in the workplace, in schools, and in every area of life: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commits—

(A) to elevating the voices, leadership, and needs of communities that face systemic barriers in the effort to end sexual violence and gender-based violence; and

(B) to support all survivors of sexual violence, including—

(i) immigrant survivors;

(ii) survivors who are incarcerated;

(iii) survivors with disabilities;

(iv) survivors of color;

(v) American Indian or Alaska Native survivors;

(vi) survivors of child sexual abuse; and

(vii) lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, and intersex survivors;

(2) supports efforts to raise awareness of the history of sexual violence prevention programs;

(3) calls upon this Chamber—

(A) to ensure that responding to the needs of sexual violence survivors is a legislative priority;

(B) to demonstrate proactive leadership in the effort to end sexual violence and gender-based violence; and

(C) to reject rollbacks of enforcement and interpretations of protections against harassment under—

(i) title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000d et seq.), which prohibits discrimination in education programs based on race, color, or national origin;

(ii) title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e et seq.), which prohibits discrimination in employment based on race, color, national origin, sex (including on the basis of sexual orientation, gender identity, sex stereotypes, pregnancy, childbirth, and related medical conditions), or religion;

(iii) title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 (20 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.), which prohibits discrimination in education programs based on sex (including on the basis of sexual orientation, gender identity, sex stereotypes,

pregnancy, termination of pregnancy, childbirth, and related medical conditions);

(iv) titles I and II of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12111 et seq.), which prohibit discrimination based on disability in employment and public schools, respectively; and

(v) section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 794), which prohibits discrimination based on disability in education programs;

(4) affirms that—

(A) title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 (20 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.), title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12131 et seq.), section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 794), and title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000d et seq.) intersect; and

(B) to address sexual violence and gender-based violence in an educational setting, it must be acknowledged that—

(i) protections under these comprehensive civil rights laws—

(I) are intersecting; and

(II) address how sexual violence and gender-based violence affect equal access to education; and

(ii) without prompt and equitable responses to sexual violence, schools may be in violation of civil rights laws;

(5) affirms the pursuit of legislative solutions that—

(A) address the unique needs and experiences of survivors of sexual violence from communities that face systemic barriers, including immigrant survivors, survivors who are incarcerated, survivors with disabilities, survivors of color, American Indian or Alaska Native survivors, survivors of child sexual abuse, and lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, and intersex survivors;

(B) clarify and strengthen existing protections from sexual harassment and other forms of discrimination in employment, housing, education, public accommodations, and Federally funded programs;

(C) allocate resources based on the needs and vulnerability of diverse survivor populations; and

(D) allocate resources for disaggregated research initiatives that shed light on the disproportionate levels of sexual violence and gender-based violence, and the impact of sexual violence and gender-based violence, on diverse survivor populations; and

(6) calls upon the executive branch to faithfully and robustly enforce laws that protect survivors of sexual violence and communities at higher risk of sexual violence and gender-based violence from harassment, discrimination, and mistreatment.

SENATE RESOLUTION 282—HONORING FORMER ASSOCIATE JUSTICE JOHN PAUL STEVENS OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. GRAHAM, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURR, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CASSIDY, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Mr. ENZI, Ms. ERNST, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. GARDNER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr.

HEINRICH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. JONES, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEE, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. REED, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROMNEY, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SASSE, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SHELBY, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. SMITH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. YOUNG) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 282

Whereas John Paul Stevens was born in Chicago, Illinois, on April 20, 1920, to Ernest James Stevens and Elizabeth Street Stevens;

Whereas John Paul Stevens, in 1941, graduated from the University of Chicago with a bachelor's degree in English;

Whereas John Paul Stevens served as a Lieutenant Commander in the United States Navy during World War II and was awarded the Bronze Star;

Whereas John Paul Stevens was the last living Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States to have served in the armed forces of the United States during World War II;

Whereas John Paul Stevens attended Northwestern University School of Law on the GI Bill, where he served as editor-in-chief of the Northwestern University Law Review and, in 1947, graduated first in his class;

Whereas John Paul Stevens served as a law clerk to Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States Wiley B. Rutledge;

Whereas John Paul Stevens was an accomplished attorney in private practice in Chicago, Illinois, and also worked as a Congressional aide;

Whereas John Paul Stevens was nominated by President Richard M. Nixon to be a judge for the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit in 1970;

Whereas John Paul Stevens was nominated by President Gerald R. Ford to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States in 1975;

Whereas John Paul Stevens served with distinction on the Supreme Court of the United States for nearly 35 years;

Whereas John Paul Stevens retired from the Supreme Court of the United States in 2010 at the age of 90;

Whereas John Paul Stevens had the third-longest tenure of any Justice to ever sit on the Supreme Court of the United States;

Whereas John Paul Stevens was a brilliant jurist, an astute writer, and a courteous but incisive questioner from the bench;

Whereas John Paul Stevens, during his decades of service on the Supreme Court of the United States, was committed to safeguarding the rights and liberties protected by the Constitution and respecting the common sense of the American people;

Whereas John Paul Stevens recognized and cherished the importance of the judiciary as an impartial guardian of the rule of law;

Whereas John Paul Stevens showed that fair and reasoned judgment transcends political labels and ideological categories;

Whereas John Paul Stevens was one of the most influential and memorable Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States;

Whereas Chief Justice John Roberts stated that John Paul Stevens' "unrelenting commitment to justice has left us a better nation";

Whereas John Paul Stevens was respected by colleagues, litigants, and the American people, and will be remembered as one of the great Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States;

Whereas John Paul Stevens was a man of Midwestern courtesy, humility, wit, and wisdom;

Whereas John Paul Stevens was an avid player of tennis, golf, ping-pong, and bridge, was a lifelong fan of the Chicago Cubs, and was well known for his fondness of bow ties;

Whereas John Paul Stevens was awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom by President Barack Obama in 2012;

Whereas John Paul Stevens was married to Elizabeth Jane Sheeren from 1942 to 1979, and had 4 children, John, Kathryn, Elizabeth, and Susan;

Whereas John Paul Stevens was married to Maryan Mulholland Simon from 1980 until her death in 2015;

Whereas John Paul Stevens, at the time of his death, was a grandfather of 9 and a great-grandfather of 13;

Whereas John Paul Stevens passed away on July 16, 2019, at the age of 99; and

Whereas the United States is deeply indebted to John Paul Stevens, a giant figure in American law: Now, therefore, be it:

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) extends heartfelt sympathies to the family and friends of Justice John Paul Stevens;

(2) commends Justice John Paul Stevens for his decades of service to the United States, including his nearly 35-year tenure on the Supreme Court of the United States; and

(3) acknowledges the enormous contributions of Justice John Paul Stevens to the United States and to American law.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I have 7 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 23, 2019, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing pending military nominations.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 23, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet

during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 23, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 23, 2019, at 10:15 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 23, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 23, 2019, at 1:30 p.m., to conduct a closed hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, OCEANS, FISHERIES, AND WEATHER

The Subcommittee on Science, Oceans, Fisheries, and Weather of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 23, 2019, at 2:15 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

NATIONAL DAY OF THE AMERICAN COWBOY

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration and that the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 265. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 265) designating July 27, 2019, as "National Day of the American Cowboy".

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. CORNYN. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 265) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of June 26, 2019, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

NATIONAL WHISTLEBLOWER APPRECIATION DAY

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration and that the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 194.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 194) designating July 30, 2019, as "National Whistleblower Appreciation Day".

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. CORNYN. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 194) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of May 8, 2019, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, JULY 24, 2019

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m., Wednesday, July 24; and further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, morning business be closed, and the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Dickson nomination under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand adjourned under the previous order following the remarks of Senator MERKLEY for up to 75 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Oregon.

TRIBUTE TO REBECCA WARD AND MEREDITH BOOKER

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, I rise to recognize two members of my team who are leaving the Senate after their years of dedicated and important work. Becca Ward will be leaving on August 7, and Meredith Booker will be leaving on Friday, July 26.

Both of them joined my team as interns. They have worked their way up within Team Merkley and have made tremendous contributions to my office and to our Nation. I know they are both going to do extraordinary things in the next chapters of their lives, but, first, it is worth reflecting on their service in the U.S. Senate.

Becca Ward has been an invaluable member of our team for 6 years. She started as an intern in my Oregon office, and she worked her way up to be my lead adviser on climate chaos and energy policy. Becca joined Team Merkley as a full-time staff assistant in 2013. Over the years, she rose to be a

legislative correspondent and then a legislative aide. She drafted and sent responses to more than 225,000 Oregonians who were concerned about the climate and the environment.

Becca's terrific work made it clear that she was capable of more, so she became my top policy adviser on the threat of climate chaos. Climate chaos presents an existential threat to our planet. Her professionalism, her substantive expertise, her creativity, and the network she created proved to be powerful tools in our working to advance a progressive climate agenda.

When Becca first started working on climate change, she took the lead and the effort to protect the Arctic Ocean from oil and gas drilling, which led to the introduction of the Stop Arctic Ocean Drilling Act. Over the course of her years on this portfolio, she has helped a lot with the mission 100 bill, which aims to transition the United States into a 100-percent clean energy economy, and with my Keep It in the Ground Act, which would stop the expansion of the leasing of our Federal publicly owned properties for the production of fossil fuels.

More recently, she has contributed by collating the Senate's version of the Green New Deal, which has set a high bar for progressive climate efforts in the future. Just last week, she led my staff through the introduction of the Good Jobs for 21st Century Energy Act—a bold, new bill that required extensive coordination between the environmental community and the labor community. It is designed to create good-paying, family-wage jobs and to have high labor standards—a race to the top in employment during the transition to clean energy.

Becca's efforts to take on the global challenge of climate chaos hasn't been limited to the United States. She has repeatedly traveled with me and on my behalf to U.N. Conference of the Parties meetings and to other international events to engage in the diplomacy that is necessary for a true global response to a global crisis. She has shepherded my efforts through the Appropriations Committee to maintain funding for climate programs and to introduce and pass bipartisan amendments that support the Green Climate Fund.

In addition to her substantive policy responsibilities, she has been an incredible team player and a remarkable individual to have with us. I think it is safe to say that Becca will likely go down in Team Merkley history as the only member of our team who is also an Olympic medalist. She has been a fantastic manager and mentor to the members of the climate team and has been a huge contributor to our office's efforts to promote diversity, equity, and inclusion in our work. I know her absence will be felt especially strongly every year when the annual cherry blossom run comes around.

Becca, you might need to plan a trip to DC for next spring.

While Becca is going to do incredible things for the planet in her next chapter of helping to expand a recently formed environmental organization, the Clean Energy Leadership Institute, she will be greatly missed here as a colleague, as a friend, and as a mentor to so many of us on the team.

We are counting on you, Becca, to save the planet, so no pressure. We appreciate your service to Oregon and to our country, and I look forward to hearing about your efforts in your journey ahead.

Now we turn to another member of Team Merkley, Meredith Booker, who is, sadly, leaving us in July—in fact, at the end of this week. Meredith embodies the heart and soul and work ethic of Team Merkley, and she will be sorely missed by everyone in the immigration, civil rights, housing, and LGBTQ rights portfolios.

Meredith joined our team as an intern in August of 2016 and quickly became indispensable, joining the legislative correspondent ranks in December of 2016.

In June of 2018, she was promoted to legislative aide and hasn't looked back, taking on more and more responsibility. She came into this position with a deep understanding and background in criminal justice and has brought a top-notch performance to every project and task she has touched. I think most of our office would agree. She is the best organized member of our team. Her meticulously crafted policy-tracker spreadsheet has helped our team stay on track in many areas and will remain a lasting part of her legacy here on Capitol Hill. It doesn't matter whether it is the smallest project or the biggest high-stakes moment, Meredith always gets it done and gets it done well.

This work ethic has extended from volunteering countless time to pitching in with coding parties. Coding parties are when the team stays late in the evening to work to try to have a prompt response to the thousands of letters we receive from Oregonians.

It stems from that to hustling to perfect every line and section of the 2019 Equality Act, resulting in a record of 47 Senate sponsors and bipartisan passage in the House of Representatives this May. That act has yet to be considered on the floor of the Senate, but it is way past time that we establish equality of opportunity for every single American.

Meredith skillfully navigated working with two different legislative assistants at times—and sometimes with one LA and sometimes with no LA—without letting a single decision, memo, or project fall through the cracks.

She managed reintroduction of the American Savings Act to expand high-quality retirement savings accounts to every American.

She managed our annual August Breastfeeding Month resolution to recognize the importance of breastfeeding

to American families and to the health of the children and the health of the mothers.

Just a short time ago, when the Department of Agriculture laid out a plan to destroy Civilian Conservation Corps centers across America, she dove into the tricky and wonky world of that and proceeded to work intensely to prevent that from happening and worked successfully to do that.

She threw herself into the challenge of the retirement integrity act, designed to make IRAs work more cost-effectively for working Americans rather than be a loophole for the megawealthy.

Though we have always known we were lucky to have Meredith on Team Merkley, she has truly stepped up and gone above and beyond in the last year, after my June 2018 trip to Brownsville led to intensive work on the issue of family and child separation and to a lot of efforts by many parties to push back against President Trump's cruelty to migrant families. When President Trump proposed locking families up in internment camps, she led the drafting of the No Internment Camps Act to say that we will never repeat that shameful chapter in our history. When President Trump threw thousands of children into unregulated child prisons at Tornillo and Homestead, she leapt into action and worked with the immigration team to draft the Shut Down Child Prison Camps Act to end this horrific practice.

Just a few weeks ago, she was instrumental to the introduction of the Stop Cruelty to Migrant Children Act, legislation to ensure we treat children with dignity and respect, and that act already has 40 Senators sponsoring it.

As I have traveled to investigate the Trump administration's policies toward migrants over the last year, Meredith's codel, or congressional delegation, binders have become legendary. Whether they are assembled in support of trips to Texas or Central America—or when she joined the trip herself, as she did earlier this year when we went to the child jail in Homestead, FL—you have never seen a binder assembled with so much meticulous care and attention to detail.

In addition to her many accomplishments supporting legislation and oversight trips, she worked with countless outside groups to organize a hugely successful hearing through the Democratic Policy and Communications Center, or DPCC, on family separation in June of 2018. She reprised that role this week—in fact, today—working to help organize another DPCC hearing on the treatment of children at the southern U.S. border. It occurred just earlier this afternoon, with the focus on stopping the cruel treatment of migrant children.

She has done all this without letting the effort to respond to Oregonians' letters fall through the cracks. She probably holds the record for our team responding to constituent mail, having

responded to more than 256,000 emails in less than 3 years and, in doing so, created 350 unique letters for those responses. That means, on average, that Meredith has created nearly 150 letters per year and sent approximately 100,000 responses per year. That is a lot of communicating with folks back home.

America is very lucky that Meredith is taking her talents to the legal arena. She will be starting at Loyola University of New Orleans this fall, working toward her law degree. Knowing how much she has done without a law degree—probably more than most fully accredited lawyers—I know the world is going to benefit enormously as she pursues that degree and puts it to work in the fight for justice and equality. The world of justice and equality will benefit just as we experience the loss of her talents here in the Senate.

Meredith, we are tremendously grateful for your contributions and will deeply miss you on Team Merkley. We will absolutely miss you both. You leave a tremendous hole in our team. Your final assignment is to make sure that we have some very talented people to carry on the terrific work you have been doing. Thank you.

MUELLER REPORT

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, as our Founders worked to design what would become the Constitution of the United States, they had certain core principles in mind—certain principles that were the exact opposite of the way government worked in Europe. They did not want to see America be a land run by a dictator or a King. They wanted to make sure that power was distributed between voting Americans, a principle Jefferson called the equal voice principle, because distributed power among the people would lead to laws by and for the people, not laws by and for the powerful.

They had another principle, and it was the opposite of what existed in Europe, where a King and perhaps the King's circle were above the law, not accountable to any core principles of conduct or any rules. What they did in their lives as rulers in that fashion just simply was accountable to no one.

But our Constitution had a different vision. The goal was to have everyone in America accountable to the law—that we are all in this together. No one is a King. No one is a dictator. That vision is really embodied in four simple words carved into the facade of the doors of the Supreme Court: Equal Justice Under Law.

If you stand here in the Johnson Room, just across the hallway, and you look out the window toward the Supreme Court, you see this: Equal Justice Under Law. It is a principle so foundational to our vision of a citizen-run nation, a nation by and for the people, that it was the source of my first political act.

If memory serves me well, I was a junior in high school. I read an article

in the evening newspaper. Now, at that point, many cities in the country had a morning newspaper, which was more of the business community's newspaper, and an evening newspaper, which was more the workers' newspaper, which made sense. For my father, a union machinist, his work started at 7 in the morning and concluded 9 hours later at 4 in the afternoon. He would come home, get the evening newspaper, read it, have dinner, and watch the evening news on television.

In that newspaper that evening, there was an article about Spiro Agnew, our former Vice President. He was convicted of taking \$100,000 in bribes, but what was his penalty? His penalty was a \$10,000 fine. I was enraged: Like, what? People get sent to prison for stealing a loaf of bread, and the Vice President illegally took \$100,000 and gets to keep 90 percent of it. What kind of a story is that to America, that if you are wealthy and powerful, you can commit crimes and keep the vast share of what you have taken in that crime? So I wrote an outraged letter to the newspaper, and the newspaper published it.

Equal Justice Under Law—it is a very important principle to our Nation. But today we face a political crisis—a crisis about whether we have a President who is above the law, and that somehow this phrase, this principle, the foundation of our country, doesn't apply to this particular President. If that stands, then we will have lost a core principle of our democratic Republic.

Tomorrow we are going to have testimony from former Special Counsel Mueller in the House of Representatives. He is scheduled for some 3 hours before the Judiciary Committee of the House and another couple of hours with the Intelligence Committee. He will be following up to share insights and answer questions related to this hefty document: Report On The Investigation Into Russian Interference In The 2016 Presidential Election.

There is a lot in this report. You wouldn't know that if you just listened to our Attorney General, because our current Attorney General Barr said there is nothing here—nothing in this. That is not the case, and I have come to the floor tonight to make that absolutely clear.

Here is the easiest way to summarize it. We received an open letter from more than 1,000 former prosecutors evaluating what is in this hefty book. It says:

We are former federal prosecutors. We served under both Republican and Democratic administrations at different levels . . . line attorneys, supervisors, special prosecutors, United States Attorneys, and senior officials at the Department of Justice. The offices in which we served were small, medium, and large; urban, suburban, and rural; and located in all parts of our country.

Each of us believes that the conduct of President Trump described in Special Counsel Robert Mueller's report would, in the case of any other person not covered by the

Office of Legal Counsel policy against indicting a sitting President, result in multiple felony charges for obstruction of justice.

The Mueller report describes several acts that satisfy all of the elements for an obstruction charge, conduct that obstructed or attempted to obstruct the truth-finding process, as to which the evidence of corrupt intent and connection to pending proceedings is overwhelming. These include:

The President's efforts to fire Mueller and to falsify evidence about that effort;

The President's efforts to limit the scope of Mueller's investigation to exclude his conduct; and

The President's efforts to prevent witnesses from cooperating with the investigators probing him and his campaign.

This statement goes on in some detail, but the point that needs to be repeated is this point: "Each of us believes that the conduct of President Trump described in Special Counsel Robert Mueller's report would, in the case of any other person . . . result in multiple felony charges."

In other words, 1,000—in fact, more than 1,000—Federal prosecutors said, in their minds, reading just this report, that the President has committed multiple crimes.

What happened to the principle of equal justice under the law? There are 1,000 Federal prosecutors who said that anyone else—you or you or you—would be indicted for felonies as a result of the conduct that is in this report. But the President has not been indicted.

Why has he not been indicted? It is simply this: An indictment has to stem from the Department of Justice, which is now run by an Attorney General who has dedicated himself to preventing the President from being held accountable rather than to the principle of equal justice under the law.

No one who does not believe in the founding principle of our Nation should ever serve as Attorney General of the United States. Yet he serves and refuses to conduct his responsibilities under the Constitution. That is why there is no choice but for the House to act. In the failure of Attorney General Barr to honor the principle that our Nation was founded on, equal justice under the law, the only recourse is the House of Representatives.

Down this hallway, through these double doors, not far away, is the House of Representatives, which is charged under the Constitution with determining if a President has committed high crimes and misdemeanors. While there may be a discussion of exactly what is meant by high crimes and misdemeanors, surely they entail acts of obstruction of justice for which any other American would have been indicted. Surely, felony crimes qualify.

The House doesn't determine guilt or innocence. The House plays the role of Federal prosecutors who are deciding whether to indict. Is the evidence sufficient to say it is credible and substantial that the individual conducted a felony, a crime? The answer by 1,000 Federal prosecutors is absolutely.

It can't be done by the Supreme Court. It can't be done by the judiciary

as long as the Attorney General is blocking it. It can be done only by the House. That is why the House has to act now and has to proceed to put together a committee on impeachment or this principle means nothing.

Then it would come to this Chamber to hold the actual trial. But there will be no trial if there is no indictment. There is no trial in the Senate Chamber if there is no impeachment, and there is no credibility to this principle in America if the House doesn't act.

So I call upon the House to convene that committee and to conduct that impeachment inquiry, and if they come out of that inquiry with 1,000 Federal prosecutors, they must act and vote to impeach.

This cannot be about politics: Is it a smart thing to do? How will it affect the next election? Will it put our Presidential candidates in a strange space? Let's do an opinion poll of America. No, absolutely not.

Our institutions are under assault, and we have a responsibility because we took an oath of office to the Constitution to defend this principle. The House took the same oath, and they have a responsibility to defend that principle.

I am going to take the time to lay out four of those charges of obstruction justice just to set the stage for tomorrow.

This is what is referred to as a "heat map." It lays out different cases in which the President interfered with the judicial process, and then it proceeds to ask: Is there substantial evidence of the three things that are needed as a foundation for saying that a felony crime has been committed?

The first is, was there an obstructive act? The second is, was there a nexus to an issue? The third is, was there criminal intent?

There are four cases in which capable individuals have reviewed the Mueller report and have said yes on all three—meaning, each of these is red.

Let's take a look at this. First, let's turn to this issue of efforts to fire Mueller. I am reading now from page 87 of this hefty report on the investigation, the special counsel's report.

On page 87, under "Analysis," it proceeds to say: "In analyzing the President's direction to McGahn to have the Special Counsel removed, the following evidence is relevant to the elements of obstruction of justice."

Then he walks through each of these three pieces:

Obstructive act. As with the President's firing of Comey, the attempt to remove the Special Counsel would qualify as an obstructive act if it would naturally obstruct the investigation and any grand jury proceedings that might flow from the inquiry. Even if the removal of the lead prosecutor would not prevent the investigation from continuing under a new appointee, a factfinder would need to consider whether the act had the potential to delay further action in the investigation, chill the actions of any replacement Special Counsel, or otherwise impede the investigation.

A threshold question is whether the President in fact directed McGahn to have the Special Counsel removed. After news organizations reported that in June 2017 the President had ordered McGahn to have the Special Counsel removed, the President publicly disputed these accounts, and privately told McGahn that he had simply wanted McGahn to bring conflicts of interest to the Department of Justice's attention. . . . Some of the President's specific language that McGahn recalled from the calls is consistent with that explanation. Substantial evidence, however, supports the conclusion that the President went further and in fact directed McGahn to call Rosenstein to have the Special Counsel removed.

First, McGahn's clear recollection was that the President directed him to tell Rosenstein not only that conflicts existed but also that "Mueller has to go." McGahn is a credible witness with no motive to lie or exaggerate given the position he held in the White House. McGahn spoke with the President twice and understood the directive the same way both times, making it unlikely that he misheard or misinterpreted the President's request. In response to that request, McGahn decided to quit because he did not want to participate in events that he described as akin to the Saturday Night Massacre.

That is a reference to Watergate.

He called his lawyer, drove to the White House, packed up his office, prepared to submit a resignation letter with his chief of staff, told Priebus that the President had asked him to "do crazy shit," and informed Priebus and Bannon that he was leaving. Those acts would be a highly unusual reaction to a request to convey information to the Department of Justice.

Second, in the days before the calls to McGahn, the President, through his counsel, had already brought the asserted conflicts to the attention of the Department of Justice. Accordingly, the President had no reason to have McGahn call Rosenstein that weekend to raise conflicts issues that already had been raised.

Third, the President's sense of urgency and repeated requests to McGahn to take immediate action on a weekend—"You gotta do this. You gotta call Rod."—support McGahn's recollection that the President wanted the Department of Justice to take action to remove the Special Counsel. Had the President instead sought only to have the Department of Justice re-examine asserted conflicts to evaluate whether they posed an ethical bar, it would have been unnecessary to set the process in motion on a Saturday and to make repeated calls to McGahn.

Finally, the President had discussed "knocking out Mueller" and raised conflicts of interest in a May 23, 2017 call to McGahn, reflecting that the President connected the conflicts to a plan to remove the Special Counsel. And in the days leading up to June 17, 2017, the President made clear to Priebus and Bannon, who then told Ruddy, that the President was considering terminating the Special Counsel. Also, during this time period, the President reached out to Christie to get his thoughts on firing the Special Counsel. This evidence shows that the President was not just seeking an examination of whether conflicts existed but instead was looking to use asserted conflicts as a way to terminate the Special Counsel.

So those are the obstructive acts, efforts to fire special counsel Mueller.

Nexus to an official proceeding [the second test]. To satisfy the proceeding requirement, it would be necessary to establish a nexus

between the President's act of seeking to terminate the Special Counsel and a pending or foreseeable grand jury proceeding.

Substantial evidence indicates that by June 17, 2017, the President knew his conduct was under investigation by a federal prosecutor who could present any evidence of federal crimes to a grand jury. On May 23, 2017, McGahn explicitly warned the President that his "biggest exposure" was not his act of firing Comey but his "other contacts" and "calls," and his "ask re: Flynn." By early June, it was widely reported in the media that federal prosecutors had issued grand jury subpoenas in the Flynn inquiry and that the Special Counsel had taken over the Flynn investigation. On June 9, 2017, the Special Counsel's Office informed the White House that investigators would be interviewing intelligence agency officials who allegedly had been asked by the President to push back against the Russia investigation. On June 14, 2017, news outlets began reporting that the President himself was being investigated for obstruction of justice. Based on widespread reporting, the President knew that such an investigation could include his request for Comey's loyalty; his request that Comey "let[] Flynn go"; his outreach to Coats and Rogers; and his termination of Comey and statement to the Russian Foreign Minister that the termination had relieved "great pressure" related to Russia. And on June 16, 2017, the day before he directed McGahn to have the Special Counsel removed, the President publicly acknowledged that his conduct was under investigation by a federal prosecutor, tweeting, "I am being investigated for firing the FBI Director by the man who told me to fire the FBI Director!"

That covers the nexus to an official proceeding, but what about this third issue, this issue of intent?

Reading again from the special counsel's report evaluating this, going to the issue of intent on efforts to fire Mueller:

Substantial evidence indicates that the President's attempts to remove the Special Counsel were linked to the Special Counsel's oversight of investigations that involved the President's conduct—and, most immediately, to reports that the President was being investigated for potential obstruction of justice.

Before the President terminated Comey, the President considered it critically important that he was not under investigation and that the public not erroneously think he was being investigated. As described in Volume II . . . advisors perceived the President, while he was drafting the Comey termination letter, to be concerned more than anything else about getting out that he was not personally under investigation. When the President learned of the appointment of the Special Counsel on May 17, 2017, he expressed further concern about the investigation, saying "[t]his is the end of my Presidency." The President also faulted Sessions for recusing, saying "you were supposed to protect me."

On June 14, 2017, when the Washington Post reported that the Special Counsel was investigating the President for obstruction of justice, the President was facing what he had wanted to avoid: a criminal investigation into his own conduct that was the subject of widespread media attention. The evidence indicates that news of the obstruction investigation prompted the President to call McGahn and seek to have the Special Counsel removed. By mid-June, the Department of Justice had already cleared the Special Counsel's service and the President's advisors had told him that the claimed conflicts

of interest were "silly" and did not provide a basis to remove the Special Counsel. On June 13, 2017, the Acting Attorney General testified before Congress that no good cause for removing the Special Counsel existed, and the President dictated a press statement to Sanders saying he had no intention of firing the Special Counsel. But the next day, the media reported that the President was under investigation for obstruction of justice and the Special Counsel was interviewing witnesses about events related to possible obstruction—spurring the President to write critical tweets about the Special Counsel's investigation. The President called McGahn at home that night and then called him on Saturday from Camp David. The evidence accordingly indicates that news that an obstruction investigation had been opened is what led the President to call McGahn to have the Special Counsel terminated.

There also is evidence that the President knew that he should not have made those calls to McGahn. The President made the calls to McGahn after McGahn had specifically told the President that the White House Counsel's Office—and McGahn himself—could not be involved in pressing conflict claims and that the President should consult with his personal counsel if he wished to raise conflicts. Instead of relying on his personal counsel to submit the conflict claims, the President sought to use his official powers to remove the Special Counsel. And after the media reported on the President's actions, he denied that he had ever ordered McGahn to have the Special Counsel terminated and made repeated efforts to have McGahn deny the story, as discussed in Volume II. . . . Those denials are contrary to the evidence and suggest the President's awareness that the direction to McGahn could be seen as improper.

So there it is—obstruction, a nexus to an investigation, and criminal intent. Those are the efforts to fire Mueller. That is the first one laid out in this quote that I am reading from, the first one that I am conveying to you all, and there are four of these I am going to go through to set the stage for understanding the gravity of what is happening in the United States. I think this conversation has been going on for so long that people have lost sight of the egregious nature and the criminal nature of the President's conduct—at least the degree laid out in exquisite detail, as I am reading it to you—and that more than 1,000 former Federal prosecutors who have looked at these top four issues and others have said that anyone else would be indicted, meaning that in their minds, these acts met the three tests for felony conduct; that is, in their view, the President committed crimes.

So the second issue is efforts to curtail the Mueller investigation. The first was to fire Mueller, and the second was to curtail the investigation. I will start reading the analysis laid out starting on page 97, continuing through page 98.

In analyzing the President's efforts to have Lewandowski deliver a message directing Sessions to publicly announce that the Special Counsel investigation would be confined to future election interference, the following evidence is relevant to the elements of obstruction of justice.

Looking first to the obstructive act.

The President's effort to send Sessions a message through Lewandowski would qualify

as an obstructive act if it would naturally obstruct the investigation in any grand jury proceedings that might flow from the inquiry.

The President sought to have Sessions announce that the President "shouldn't have a Special Prosecutor/Counsel" and that Sessions was going to "meet with the Special Prosecutor to explain this is very unfair and let the Special Prosecutor move forward with investigating election meddling for future elections so that nothing can happen in future elections." The President wanted Sessions to disregard his recusal from the investigation, which had followed from a former DOJ ethics review, and have Sessions declare that he knew "for a fact" that "there were no Russians involved in the campaign" because he "was there." The President further directed that Sessions should explain that the President should not be subject to an investigation "because he hasn't done anything wrong." Taken together, the President's directives indicate that Sessions was being instructed to tell the Special Counsel to end the existing investigation into the President and his campaign, with the Special Counsel being permitted to "move forward with investigating election meddling for future elections."

So the obstructive act was perceived to box in the Mueller investigation so it wouldn't touch on the President. That is an obstruction of justice. But is there a nexus to an official proceeding? That is next addressed in the Mueller report as follows:

As described above, by the time of the President's initial one-on-one meeting with Lewandowski on June 19, 2017, the existence of a grand jury investigation supervised by the Special Counsel was public knowledge. By the time of the President's follow-up meeting with Lewandowski—

I bet you would like to know what comes next, but take a look here. I can't tell you because it has been blacked out. So whatever it was, it created a key point about the nexus to the official proceeding. The section goes on after the blacked out section:

To satisfy the nexus requirement, it would be necessary to show that limiting the Special Counsel's investigation would have the natural and probable effect of impeding that grand jury proceeding.

So nexus and substantial evidence. Let's go to intent. Again, I am reading from page 97:

Substantial evidence indicates that the President's effort to have Sessions limit the scope of the Special Counsel's investigation to future election interference was intended to prevent further investigative scrutiny of the President's and his campaign's conduct.

That sums it up. Then it goes on in some greater detail:

As previously described, see Volume II . . . the President knew that the Russian investigation was focused in part on his campaign, and he perceived allegations of Russian interference to cast doubt on the legitimacy of his election. The President further knew that the investigation had broadened to include his own conduct and whether he had obstructed justice. Those investigations would not proceed if the Special Counsel's jurisdiction were limited to future election interference only.

The timing and circumstances of the President's actions support the conclusion that he sought that result. The President's initial direction that Sessions should limit the Special Counsel's investigation came just 2 days

after the President ordered McGahn to have the Special Counsel removed, which itself followed public reports that the President was personally under investigation for obstruction of justice. The sequence of those events raises an inference that after seeking to terminate the Special Counsel, the President sought to exclude his and his campaign's conduct from the investigation's scope. The President raised the matter with Lewandowski again on July 19, 2017, just days after emails and information about the June 9, 2016 meeting between Russians and senior campaign officials had been publicly disclosed, generating substantial media coverage and investigative interest.

The manner in which the President acted provides additional evidence of his intent. Rather than rely on official channels, the President met with Lewandowski alone in the Oval Office. The President selected a loyal "devotee" outside the White House to deliver the message, supporting an inference that he was working outside White House channels, including McGahn, who had previously resisted contacting the Department of Justice about the Special Counsel. The President also did not contact the Acting Attorney General, who had just testified publicly that there was no cause to remove the Special Counsel. Instead, the President tried to use Sessions to restrict and redirect the Special Counsel's investigation when Sessions was recused and could not properly take any action on it.

The July 19, 2017 events provide further evidence of the President's intent. The President followed up with Lewandowski in a separate one-on-one meeting one month after he first dictated the message for Sessions, demonstrating he still sought to pursue the request. And just hours after Lewandowski assured the President that the message would soon be delivered to Sessions, the President gave an unplanned interview to the New York Times in which he publicly attacked Sessions and raised questions about his job security. Four days later, on July 22, 2017, the President directed Priebus to obtain Sessions' resignation. That evidence could raise an inference that the President wanted Sessions to realize that his job might be on the line as he evaluated whether to comply with the President's direction that Sessions publicly announce that, notwithstanding his recusal, he was going to confine the Special Counsel's investigation to future election interference.

It is laid out in great detail—an obstructive act, a nexus to an official proceeding, and the issue of intent. This did not happen by accident—not on the efforts to fire Mueller and not on the efforts to curtail the Mueller investigation.

Now we will go to the third major point here—the order to McGahn to deny the attempt to fire Mueller. This analysis in the special prosecutor's report starts on page 118.

In analyzing the President's efforts to have McGahn deny that he had been ordered to have the Special Counsel removed, the following evidence is relevant to the elements of obstruction of justice.

First, obstructive act.

The President's repeated efforts to get McGahn to create a record denying that the President had directed him to remove the Special Counsel would qualify as an obstructive act if it had a natural tendency to constrain McGahn from testifying truthfully or to undermine his credibility as a potential witness if he testified consistently with his memory rather than with what the record said.

There is some evidence that at the time the New York Times and Washington Post stories were published in late January 2018, the President believed the stories were wrong and that he had never told McGahn to have Rosenstein remove the Special Counsel. The President correctly understood that McGahn had not told the President directly that he planned to resign. In addition, the President told Priebus and Porter that he had not sought to terminate the Special Counsel, and in the Oval Office meeting with McGahn, the President said, "I never said to fire Mueller. I never said 'fire.'" That evidence could indicate that the President was not attempting to persuade McGahn to change his story but instead offering his own but different recollection of the substance of his June 2017 conversations with McGahn and McGahn's reaction to them.

Other evidence cuts against that understanding of the President's conduct.

That is an important line to understand. Is it possible that the President simply had a different recollection? And the answer in the special prosecutor's report is this: "Other evidence cuts against that understanding."

The special counsel continues:

As previously described, see Volume II . . . substantial evidence supports McGahn's account that the President had directed him to have the Special Counsel removed, including the timing and context of the President's directive; the manner in which McGahn reacted; and the fact that the President had been told the conflicts were insubstantial, were being considered by the Department of Justice, and should be raised with the President's personal counsel rather than brought to McGahn. In addition, the President's subsequent denials that he had told McGahn to have the Special Counsel removed were carefully worded. When first asked about the New York Times story, the President said, "Fake news, folks. Fake news. A typical New York Times fake story." And when the President spoke with McGahn in the Oval Office, he focused on whether he had used the word "fire," saying, "I never said to fire Mueller. I never said 'fire.'"

He then said:

"Did I say the word 'fire'? The President's assertion in the Oval Office meeting that he had never directed McGahn to have the Special Counsel removed thus runs counter to the evidence.

In addition, even if the President sincerely disagreed with McGahn's memory of the June 17, 2017 events, the evidence indicates that the President knew by the time of the Oval Office meeting that McGahn's account differed and that McGahn was firm in his views. Shortly after the story broke, the President's counsel told McGahn's counsel that the President wanted McGahn to make a statement denying he had been asked to fire the Special Counsel, but McGahn responded through his counsel that that aspect of the story was accurate and he therefore could not comply with the President's request. The President then directed Sanders to tell McGahn to correct the story, but McGahn told her he would not do so because the story was accurate in reporting on the President's order. Consistent with that position, McGahn never issued a correction. More than a week later, the President brought up the issue again with Porter, made comments indicating that the President thought McGahn had leaked the story, and directed Porter to have McGahn create a record denying that the President had tried to fire the Special Counsel. At that point, the President said he might "have to get rid

of' McGahn if McGahn did not comply. McGahn again refused and told Porter, as he told Sanders and as his counsel had told the President's counsel, that the President had in fact ordered him to have Rosenstein remove the Special Counsel. That evidence indicates that by the time of the Oval Office meeting the President was aware that McGahn did not think the story was false and did not want to issue a statement or create a written record denying facts that McGahn believed to be true. The President nevertheless persisted and asked McGahn to repudiate facts that McGahn had repeatedly said were accurate.

So that is the evidence of the order to McGahn to deny that he had been instructed to fire Mueller by the President. But is there a nexus to an official proceeding—the second test? The special counsel's report continues to address that issue.

Nexus to an official proceeding. By January 2018, the Special Counsel's use of a grand jury had been further confirmed by the return of several indictments. The President also was aware that the Special Counsel was investigating obstruction-related events because, among other reasons, on January 8, 2018, the Special Counsel's office provided his counsel with a detailed list of topics for a possible interview with the President. The President knew that McGahn had personal knowledge in many of the events the Special Counsel was investigating and that McGahn had already been interviewed by Special Counsel investigators. And in the Oval Office meeting, the President indicated he knew that McGahn had told the Special Counsel's Office about the President's effort to remove the Special Counsel. The President challenged McGahn for disclosing that information and for taking notes that he viewed as creating unnecessary legal exposure. That evidence indicates the President's awareness that the June 17, 2017 events were relevant to the Special Counsel's investigation and any grand jury investigation that might grow out of it.

To establish a nexus, it would be necessary to show that the President's actions would have the natural tendency to affect such a proceeding or that they would hinder, delay or prevent the communication of information to investigators. Because McGahn had spoken to Special Counsel investigators before January 2018, the President could not have been seeking to influence his prior statements in those interviews. But because McGahn had repeatedly spoken to investigators and the obstruction inquiry was not complete, it was foreseeable that he would be interviewed again on obstruction-related topics. If the President were focused solely on a press strategy in seeking to have McGahn refute the New York Times article, a nexus to a proceeding or to further investigative interviews would not be shown. But the President's efforts to have McGahn write a letter "for our records" approximately ten days after the story had come out—well past the typical time to issue a correction for a news story—indicates the President was not focused solely on press strategy, but instead likely contemplated the ongoing investigation and any proceedings arising from it.

So that is the nexus.

And now to intent.

Substantial evidence indicates that in repeatedly urging McGahn to dispute that he was ordered to have the Special Counsel terminated, the President acted for the purpose of influencing McGahn's account in order to deflect or prevent further scrutiny of the President's conduct towards the investigation.

That summarizes the intent.

Let me just repeat a piece of that.

Substantial evidence indicates that in repeatedly urging McGhan to dispute that he was ordered to have the Special Counsel terminated—

In other words, his repeated efforts to have McGhan lie—

the President acted for the purpose of influencing McGhan's account in order to deflect or prevent further scrutiny of the President's conduct. . . .

Several facts support that conclusion. The President made repeated attempts to get McGhan to change his story.

Not just one, but repeated attempts.

As described above, by the time of the last attempt, the evidence suggests that the President had been told on multiple occasions that McGhan believed the President had ordered him to have the Special Counsel terminated. McGhan interpreted his encounter with the President in the Oval Office as an attempt to test his mettle and see how committed he was to his memory of what had occurred. The President had already laid the groundwork for pressing McGhan to alter his account by telling Porter that it might be necessary to fire McGhan if he did not deny the story, and Porter relayed that statement to McGhan. Additional evidence of the President's intent might be gleaned from the fact that his counsel was sufficiently alarmed by the prospect of the President's meeting with McGhan that he called McGhan's counsel and said that McGhan could not resign no matter what happened in the Oval Office that day. The President's counsel was well aware of McGhan's resolve not to issue what he believed to be a false account of events despite the President's request. Finally, as noted above, the President brought up the Special Counsel investigation in his Oval Office meeting with McGhan and criticized him for telling this Office about the June 17, 2017 events. The President's statements reflect his understanding—and his displeasure—that those events would be part of an obstruction-of-justice inquiry.

So there it is—the intent, all laid out very, very clearly in this report—obstructive acts, a nexus to an official proceeding, and the clear intent.

So let's turn to the fourth issue: Conduct toward Manafort. This can be found on page 131 of the special counsel's report.

In analyzing the President's conduct towards Flynn, Manafort—

And a third person who has been blacked out in the record—

the following evidence is relevant to the elements of obstruction of justice:

Section a, Obstructive act.

Here we are addressing if there is evidence—is there substantial evidence—of the President's conduct toward Manafort.

With respect to Manafort, there is evidence that the President's actions had the potential to influence Manafort's decision whether to cooperate with the government. The President and his personal counsel made repeated statements suggesting that a pardon was a possibility for Manafort, while also making it clear that the President did not want Manafort to “flip” and cooperate with the government. On June 15, 2018, the day the judge presiding over Manafort's D.C. case was considering whether to revoke his bail, the President said that he “felt badly” for Manafort and stated, “I think a lot of it is very unfair.” And when asked about a pardon

for Manafort, the President said, “I do want to see people treated fairly. That's what it's all about.” Later that day, after Manafort's bail was revoked, the President called it a “tough sentence” that was “Very unfair!” Two days later, the President's personal counsel stated that individuals involved in the Special Counsel's investigation could receive a pardon “if in fact the [P]resident and his advisors. . . come to the conclusion that you have been treated unfairly”—using language that paralleled how the President had already described the treatment of Manafort. Those statements, combined with the President's commendation of Manafort for being a “brave man” who “refused to ‘break,’” suggested that a pardon was a more likely possibility if Manafort continued not to cooperate with the government. And while Manafort eventually pleaded guilty pursuant to a cooperation agreement, he was found to have violated the agreement by lying to investigators.

The President's public statements during the Manafort trial, including during jury deliberations, also had the potential to influence the trial jury. On the second day of trial, for example, the President called the prosecution a “terrible situation” and a “hoax” that “continues to stain our country” and referred to Manafort as a “Reagan/Dole darling” who was “serving solitary confinement” even though he was “convicted of nothing.” Those statements were widely picked up by the press. While jurors were instructed not to watch or read news stories about the case and are presumed to follow those instructions, the President's statements during the trial generated substantial media coverage that could have reached jurors if they happened to see the statements or learned about them from others.

And the President's statements during deliberations of Manafort “happens to be a very good person” and that “it's very sad what they've done to Paul Manafort” had the potential to influence jurors who learned of the statements, which the President made just as jurors were considering whether to convict or acquit Manafort.

Let me point out here that I see in this book substantial sections have been blocked out under No. 8, the Obstructive Act and under section C, the Intent. In spite of part of that section being blacked out, that was the substantial evidence of the effort to influence Paul Manafort and obstruct justice.

Nexus to an official proceeding. The President's actions towards Flynn and Manafort and a third person blacked out in this book appeared to have been connected to pending or anticipated official proceedings involving each individual.

The President's conduct towards Flynn principally occurred when both were under criminal investigation by the Special Counsel's Office and press reports speculated about whether they would cooperate with the Special Counsel's investigation. And the President's conduct toward Manafort was directly connected to the official proceedings involving him. The President made statements about Manafort and the charges against him during Manafort's criminal trial. And the President's comments about the prospect of Manafort “flipping” occurred when it was clear the Special Counsel continued to oversee grand jury proceedings.

So there is the nexus laid out very clearly in this report on this effort to influence Manafort's testimony.

And then to intent, page 132.

Evidence concerning the President's conduct towards Manafort indicates that the

President intended to encourage Manafort to not cooperate with the government. Before Manafort was convicted, the President repeatedly stated that Manafort had been treated unfairly. One day after Manafort was convicted on eight felony charges and potentially faced a lengthy prison term, the President said that Manafort was a “brave man” for refusing to “break” and that “flipping” “almost ought to be outlawed.” At the same time, although the President privately told aides he did not like Manafort, he publicly called Manafort “a good man” and said he had a “wonderful family.” And when the President was asked whether he was asked whether he was considering a pardon for Manafort, the President did not respond directly and instead said he had “great respect for what [Manafort]’s done, in terms of what he's gone through.” The President added that “some of the charges they threw against him, every consultant, every lobbyist in Washington probably does.” In light of the President's counsel's previous statements that the investigations “might get cleaned up with some presidential pardons” and that a pardon would be possible if the President come[s] to the conclusion that you have been treated unfairly.” The evidence supports the inference that the President intended Manafort to believe that he could receive a pardon, which would make cooperation with the government as a means of a lesser sentence unnecessary.

To read that again:

The evidence supports the inference that the President intended Manafort to believe that he could receive a pardon which would make cooperation with the government as a means of obtaining a lesser sentence unnecessary.

The special counsel continues under intent:

We also examined the evidence of the President's intent making public statements about Manafort at the beginning of his trial and when the jury was deliberating. Some evidence supports a conclusion the President intended, at least in part, to influence the jury. The trial generated widespread publicity, and as the jury began to deliberate, commentators suggested that an acquittal would add pressure to end the Special Counsel's investigation. By publicly stating on the second day of deliberations that Manafort “happens to be a very good person” and that “it's very sad what they've done to Paul Manafort” right after calling the Special Counsel's investigation a “rigged witch hunt,” the President's statements could, if they reached jurors, have the natural tendency to engender sympathy for Manafort among jurors, and a factfinder could infer that the President intended that result. But there are alternative explanations to the President's comments, including that he genuinely felt sorry for Manafort or that his goal was not to influence the jury but influence public opinion. The President's comments also could have been intended to continue sending a message to Manafort that a pardon was possible. As described above, the President made his comments about Manafort being “a very good person” immediately after declining to answer questions about whether he would pardon Manafort.

You might be very interested in the additional information about intent, but I can't read it to you because it is blacked out. Nonetheless, in that previous paragraph, it is clearly declared the evidence supports the inference the President intended Manafort to believe he could receive a pardon, which would make cooperation with the government

as a means of obtaining a lesser sentence unnecessary.

Those are the first four cases of obstruction of justice in which a special prosecutor lays out substantial evidence on the obstructive act, on the nexus, and on the intent on the efforts to fire Mueller, on the efforts to curtail the Mueller investigation, on the order to McGahn to deny that he had attempted to fire Mueller, and on the effort to influence Manafort by alluding to a potential pardon.

There is a lot more in this book—many other cases that, in the eyes of analysts, isn't as strong as the first four, but the evidence could support it, whether it is substantial evidence, but still very serious stories of efforts to obstruct justice.

Ordinary Americans might say: If, in fact, the special prosecutor found all three standards met on at least four of these cases, then why hasn't the President been indicted? Well, indictment has to come from the executive branch and the Attorney General, who runs the Department of Justice, who isn't going to do that.

There is a policy within the White House that basically says a President can't be indicted. Pull out your Constitution and try to find where the Constitution says that a President can't be indicted. Try to find that because it is not in there.

"Equal justice under law." That is what our Constitution is about, not the case of a King who is above the law, so we have a democratic republic, if we can keep it.

But that means that we are in this principle "equal justice under law," and if the special prosecutor is not going to make recommendations based on the White House executive branch principle that a President can't be indicted and the Department of Justice is not going to do it, there is only one option, and that is the House of Representatives. The House of Representatives has the huge responsibility of defending this principle "equal justice under law." No one else is going to do it. It can't be done here in the Senate because the Constitution says the responsibility is in the House of Representatives to decide whether to impeach a President.

There has been a lot of discussion of politics: Is this a smart thing to do? Does it take up too much time? How will people respond? I can tell you this, if the House fails to act, then this "equal justice under law" means nothing.

This book is full of events that a thousand former Federal prosecutors have told us constitutes criminal conduct, and that is why the House must, in defending their oath of office to the

Constitution, bring a committee together and defend the Constitution—the vision—that no one in the United States of America, not even the President, is above the law. It is time—past time—to convene impeachment proceedings.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M.
TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 9:30 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7:51 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, July 24, 2019, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nomination received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

DAVID L. NORQUIST, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, VICE PATRICK M. SHANAHAN, RESIGNED.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate July 23, 2019:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

MARK T. ESPER, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RUDY GIULIANI COMMENTS REGARDING THE IRANIAN REGIME OF TERROR

HON. PAUL A. GOSAR

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 2019

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Speaker, I rise today to include in the RECORD comments about the situation in Iran that I believe are relevant and should be widely shared. The comments, from former New York City Mayor and attorney to the U.S. President Rudy Giuliani, address peaceful regime change in Iran and the work of the Iranian Resistance. Giuliani delivered this speech at the International Gathering at Ashraf-3, Tirana, Albania, which is home to members of the Iranian opposition, the Mujahedin-e Khalq (PMOI/MEK). More than 350 bipartisan dignitaries and parliamentarians from 47 countries attended the conference. I offer these comments for thoughtful discussion as follows:

Giuliani: “Thanks to you and particularly to the people who live here in Ashraf 3. You’ll be the ones who lead your people to freedom and you’ll be honored forever in Iranian history and in the history of those who love and are willing to die for freedom. God bless you.

This organization has grown and grown and grown and I feel in this room today a kind of optimism that I don’t remember feeling before when we were in Paris. I feel an optimism maybe because you’ve done a miracle here in Ashraf. If we were to build this in New York City, it would take 15 years and 14 corruption investigations. I was here a year and a half ago, this wasn’t here.

And of course, all of this is possible because of the leadership of Madame Maryam Rajavi, a truly exceptional leader. Just like her husband Massoud Rajavi, who began this movement in one very brave act. He refused to swear allegiance to the Supreme Leader Khomeini to his face. He said, “No, I will not swear allegiance to you. I will not deliver my nation to a tyrant.”

I’m here to say three things. First, I accuse the Ayatollah and Rouhani and all of their sycophants and followers of mass murder, crimes against humanity. We should be embarrassed for our countries if they haven’t stood up against this. There’s no middle ground here. These people have killed at least 120,000 members and associates of this great organization. You see the book. You go through the sad, tragic, but heroic exhibit they have of the martyrs to freedom. Look at the photograph of the people in the infirmary being treated for illness, slaughtered just a few years ago. Killed 52 of them of the last 100 people who stayed at Ashraf, they tried to wipe them all out. In 1988, in two months they slaughtered 30,000 people. These are not numbers, these are human lives.

So there are three things that we have to do. Number one, we have to get the governments of Europe to stand up, to wake up, to reclaim their dignity and their honor. These are the countries that gave us democracy. Greece, Rome, Italy, France, United Kingdom, Germany, all places in which freedom was born, democracy was born, democracy

emerged. Democracy for my nation came out of Europe and the experience of Europe. So how can the leaders of those countries turn their back on mass murder? How can they do it and live with themselves? It’s time to end that shameful disregard.

There’s no statute of limitations on murder. I prosecuted two Nazis 40 years after their horrible deeds. One killed 20,000 people, the other killed 12,000 people and we found them and it took years and we brought them to justice. The people who slaughtered 30,000 people in 1988 should be identified, they should be prosecuted, and they should either be imprisoned for life or executed. They’re criminals. They’re murderers. They’re not leaders of countries. They are no better than the murderer in the street except they’re worse because they’re mass murderers.

I am so proud of my government because we have stood up. We looked at that agreement that would make Iran a nuclear power and we said tear it up. We’re not going to put nuclear weapons in the hands of a maniac. Well, I say to the leaders of Europe, you can be liberators too. You can go down in history as fighters for freedom.

Isn’t that better than just running a government and making money and giving blood money to Iran? How can you do commerce with them? We all know they’re the largest sponsor of terrorism in the world. What does that mean? That means they fund and they supply murderers not only in their own country but all over the world. And when you give them money, when you relieve them of a debt, which my government did in the prior administration, and put over a billion dollars back in their hands, you are supporting murder. What do they use it for? Their people know, their people know that when they get money, when a French company or a German company does business with them, that money, that profit is going to be used to kill people in Syria or to kill people somewhere else or to send people to Albania to kill us or to send people to France like they did last year to kill Madame Rajavi and us. That’s what they’re funding, don’t you realize it? That makes you complicit in murder.

Number two, let’s make it clear, there is an alternative to this horrible regime of terror. This isn’t one of those situations in which we have the choice of deposing a horrible dictator and we don’t know if a more horrible one will come along. Right? And when we saw that happen, we saw it happen in Egypt, in some ways we saw it happen in Libya.

But here we don’t have that problem. We’ve got the worst regime in the world by far, the biggest sponsor of terrorism in the world. And then we have the National Council, the NCRI, led by the president-elect, Madame Rajavi. Coalition of resistance organizations respected throughout the world. There are representatives of most of the major countries in the world here. They’ve gotten to know her. They’ve gotten to respect her. In my country, she’s thoroughly respected.

We know there’s a group of people who have been fighting for freedom all their lives, who have lost the closest people to them in the fight for freedom, who are dedicated to it.

People here at Ashraf, let’s make it clear. I spent a lot of time with them. These are

people who are dedicated to freedom. And if you think that’s a cult, then there’s something wrong with you. There’s something missing in your soul.

But we know that there is a government in exile, it negotiates with the whole world, and it’s written down plain as can be what it stands for. And it looks just like our Bill of Rights, just like the universal declarations of freedom and decency and human rights enshrined in the great documents of the world. Free elections within six months is the promise, and I believe it will be fulfilled. They’re for gender equality. They’re for human rights. They’re for a system of law. They’re for we don’t imprison someone unless they have a fair trial. And because of their history, they oppose capital punishment, because there’s been too much of it. And it isn’t just capital punishment, it’s murder in their country. This is a good organization. And it’s an organization that is ready, willing and able not to take over Iran but to guide Iran to elections as quickly as possible and hopefully they will be part of the coalition governing Iran like they’re part of the coalition that is trying to guide Iran to freedom. This is a group that we can support. It’s a group that we should stop maligning and it’s a group that should make us comfortable having regime change in the worst regime in the world.

Here’s what you can do. You can be a witness like in the Biblical sense of a witness. You know something that a lot of people don’t know. You know really how bad it is in Iran. And you know about MEK. And you know about Madame Rajavi. And you know the truth, not the lies, “the cult, they don’t have support in Iran.” Why has the Ayatollah been murdering them for 40 years if they don’t have support in Iran? The Ayatollah, Rouhani, have said that this organization is the only one that’s really a danger to them.

You now have a responsibility because of your knowledge. Don’t be euphemistic about it. Don’t hide your eyes. You’ve got to get the leaders of your country to stand up so you can all be proud of your country and its heritage.

I get attacked and my colleagues who will be here in a moment get attacked all the time in America. Why we’re doing this? We’re doing it really very simply because we love freedom and we can’t turn our back on people who are being treated this way and we can’t turn our back on a situation that could be catastrophic for them and catastrophic for the world. You know what I say to them? Keep doing it. Keep doing it. I wear it as a badge of honor. I support freedom, you support oppression. I support democracy, you support a dictatorship. I support decent people who share the values of decent governments, and you support mass murderers. Now who’s right and who’s wrong?

But I know and I feel as I’ve told you, and I know why there’s an optimism in this room. Because we’re going to be in Tehran much sooner than all those cynics believe. You know why? [Because we are Hazer, Hazer, Hazer. (We’re ready).”

• This “bullet” symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

REMEMBERING HÉCTOR FIGUEROA

HON. NYDIA M. VELÁZQUEZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 2019

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today to remember Héctor Figueroa, a champion for workers' rights, an advocate for immigrants, a New Yorker, a passionate Puerto Rican and my dear friend. Above all, Héctor was a fighter for the vulnerable, the down-trodden and those who were treated unfairly. Sadly, Héctor passed last week. He will be honored at a public service on Wednesday in New York City.

Héctor Figueroa was known most notably for his leadership of 32BJ SEIU. Under his leadership, 32BJ SEIU grew by over 50,000 members and passed dozens of local and state-level policies. Héctor previously worked as SEIU's Organizing Director for Puerto Rico, winning collective bargaining rights for teachers, as well as for SEIU's Justice for Janitors campaign and a researcher for Amalgamated Clothing and Textile Workers Union (Workers United).

Most recently, Héctor was central to building support for relief in Puerto Rico after Hurricane María. Born in Ponce as the son of two educators, the Island was near and dear to his heart. In the dark months following Hurricane María, Héctor was critical to mobilizing support among New York's Puerto Rican community, 32BJ members and non-members alike, to send aid to the Island and build political momentum for Washington to do better in channeling assistance to our fellow citizens as they struggled through a humanitarian crisis.

Throughout his life, Héctor made waves as a progressive fighter for justice for all people. He was relentless in advocating for the rights of the doormen and doorwomen, custodial workers, airport security guards and others who constituted 32BJ's membership. However, he was also on the frontlines helping taxicab drivers, fast food workers and laborers in every sector achieve fairer wages and improved conditions. To him, anyone who was oppressed was an ally and he was ready to join arms with them and march in common cause.

His belief that all workers were deserving of respect and kindness extended beyond his work as a labor leader; it infused his very demeanor. Héctor treated everyone, from the youngest organizers, to the most junior political aides, to the most powerful elected officials with the same kindness and warmth.

Whether it was fighting to expand healthcare, protecting immigrant communities from ICE, strengthening voter rights or addressing the threats of climate change, Héctor was on the frontlines of every battle related to economic and social justice. Just last week, this House voted to raise the federal minimum wage, a milestone achievement, years in the making. I like to think wherever he is, that victory would bring a smile to Héctor's face.

New York City and working people everywhere have lost a champion. I, personally, have lost a dear friend. From my earliest days in politics, I could always count on Héctor for wise advice and kind counsel. I'll miss our days together and fighting alongside one another. While he was taken from us too young, we'll honor his memory by continuing to ad-

vance the causes that inspired him. As Héctor always said, "We'll keep organizing." Yes, my friend, we will.

**RECOGNIZING THE DC GRAYS
BASEBALL TEAM****HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON**

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 2019

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to ask the House of Representatives to join me in recognizing the DC Grays for their commitment and contribution to increasing interest and youth participation in baseball and softball in the District of Columbia. In particular, I want to recognize the DC Grays 2019 summer college baseball team and the annual Capitol Hill reception.

The DC Grays is a talented collegiate summer baseball team that, in addition to competing in the Cal Ripken Collegiate Baseball League, strives to engage inner-city youth and their families with baseball. Their mission is to be "ambassadors for baseball" in the District by running summer baseball camps and clinics for D.C. youth.

Named for the champion Homestead Grays from the Negro Leagues, the DC Grays reaches out to African-American ballplayers who may have been overlooked by other teams.

The DC Grays partners with Major League Baseball (MLB) to further help its mission of providing disadvantaged youth an opportunity to learn and enjoy the game of baseball. The programs help motivate young players to stay in school and pursue secondary education. MLB's RBI program helps teach youth not only the importance of success on the field but also in the classroom and the community. This year, the DC Grays RBI is sponsoring two summer baseball leagues and two travel softball teams for kids from Wards 6, 7, and 8 in D.C.—in addition to fall ball programs and winter training. There are 250 kids participating in DC Grays RBI programs this year.

Last year, the DC Grays participated in MLB's unveiling of the new Josh Gibson mural on U Street across from Ben's Chili Bowl, and their players attended an event to honor Jackie Robinson as part of MLB's all-star festivities. They strive to honor the Negro Leagues and its role in Washington baseball history. Each year, the DC Grays hosts a salute to Negro League Baseball in collaboration with the Hubert Simons League Museum.

Madam Speaker, I ask the House to join me in commending the DC Grays for the important work it has done and continues to do in the community. We wish the DC Grays luck in continuing to inspire and engage disadvantaged youth.

**RECOGNIZING THE CHAMBERS
COUNTY COURTHOUSE ON ITS
DESIGNATION AS A TEXAS
STATE HISTORICAL MARKER****HON. BRIAN BABIN**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 2019

Mr. BABIN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Chambers County Courthouse

for its designation as an official Texas State Historical Marker.

Named after Texas pioneer Major General Thomas Jefferson Chambers, Chambers County was established in 1858. Until the early 20th century, Wallisville was the county seat and the location for the first three Chambers County courthouses built in 1858, 1880 and 1887 respectively. However, Anahuac's rice canal system and the presence of wild hogs in Wallisville prompted an election in 1907 that made Anahuac the county seat in 1908.

After the election and the move, the county constructed a new courthouse. Completed in 1912 at its current location, the new municipal building included a jail, indoor plumbing, telephones, and electric lights. Built in the Renaissance Revival style, its imposing figure boasted large columns and a stone exterior. The building, however, burned down on April 28, 1935.

Later in 1935, County Treasurer Grover C. Wilcox desired a modern courthouse "in line with the growth of the town." As a part of federal New Deal programs, the Public Works Administration contributed funds for the design and construction. Designed by Corneil G. Curtis and built by notable contractor Robert E. McKee, construction finished in May 1937 on the three-story, ashlar limestone building. A combination of art deco and modern architectural styles (1920s to 1940s), the courthouse's exterior showcases vertical lines, a symmetrical façade, geometric shapes, and simple ornamentation. Since its construction, little has changed about this unique building. Throughout its history, the Chambers County Courthouse has not only acted as a focal point of the community but has also reflected the county's economic, political and social history.

As a former member of the Texas Historic Commission, I know this is a great honor for the community. I wish all of my friends in Chambers County well as they celebrate the dedication on July 23rd.

**HONORING ARKANSAS'S KOREAN
WAR VETERANS****HON. BRUCE WESTERMAN**

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 2019

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Arkansas's Korean War veteran commemorations. This summer, the Arkansas Department of Veterans Affairs is honoring the men and women who served our country and defended South Korea during the Cold War.

In an oft-forgotten chapter of history, Korean War soldiers from the United States provided vital assistance to the South Korean army. During a volatile time, their service prevented North Korean forces from taking over the entire Korean peninsula.

Arkansas has a rich history of bravery and patriotism, and I'm honored to recognize our Korean War veterans at these commemoration events. I thank each one of them for their service, and hope their legacies continue for generations to come.

HONORING THE INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE OF MINNESOTA ON THE OCCASION OF ITS 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 2019

Ms. McCOLLUM. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the International Institute of Minnesota on the occasion of its 100th anniversary. The Institute's original mission is as vital today as it was after World War I when it welcomed refugees fleeing strife and instability in their homelands and helped them achieve self-sufficiency and full membership in American life.

In 1919, leaders of the Saint Paul YWCA came together to address an urgent need in the community to serve those who were arriving to Minnesota, displaced in the aftermath of the "War to End All Wars." Out of this effort, the Institute became one of the first state resettlement voluntary agencies (VOLAGS).

The onset of World War II saw the need for the Institute's services to expand. During this time, the organization partnered with the War Relocation Authority, helping to free Japanese-Americans from internment camps and working as translators and codebreakers at Fort Snelling. At the end of the Vietnam War, many refugees were displaced from Southeast Asia to Minnesota, particularly ethnic Hmong and others from Cambodia, Laos and Vietnam. Since 1974, the Institute has resettled approximately 25,000 refugees from every region of the world, including recent arrivals from Somalia and Myanmar.

As economists point to increasingly tight labor markets and a growing scarcity of workers as two of our state's most significant barriers to sustained economic growth, the Institute contributes to our economic vitality by opening the door for those pursuing the American dream. By partnering with new Americans on a path to citizenship, entrepreneurship and full membership in our community, state and country, the Institute has empowered thousands of new Americans to become our trusted doctors, business leaders, teachers, engineers, scientists, policemen and soldiers.

Recognizing that new Americans enrich our state in many ways, the Institute honors and shares our state's growing diversity and fosters cultural understanding. For nearly 90 years, the Institute's Festival of Nations has drawn thousands of people together each May to celebrate the many traditions that are shared by Minnesotans. Through this festival, Minnesotans can better appreciate how as a state and nation of Native Americans and immigrants, our strength is our diversity of backgrounds, viewpoints and religions.

The motto inscribed on the Great Seal of the United States: "E Pluribus Unum—Out of Many, One" underscores that the foundation of our nation has always been the collective power of many different people coming together. For 100 years, the International Institute of Minnesota has proudly supported our nation by welcoming and empowering new refugees and immigrants from different backgrounds to come together as new Americans.

Please join me to congratulate the staff, volunteers and donors to the International Institute of Minnesota for providing 100 years of

hospitality, empowerment, hope and opportunity for new Americans.

CONGRATULATING JOHN F. MITTON FOR BEING VOTED INTO THE TEXAS RADIO HALL OF FAME

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 2019

Mr. OLSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate John F. Mitton from Missouri City, Texas for being voted into the Texas Radio Hall of Fame.

Mitton, president of a national advertising agency based in Sugar Land, is one of only twenty Texas broadcasters who will be inducted into the Hall of Fame. Inductions will be held on November 2, 2019, at the Texas Museum of Broadcasting and Communications. Mitton has always had a strong suit for "listening to his clients . . . [and] helping develop and refine some of the best niche products ever featured in Texas radio."

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to John Mitton for being elected into the Texas Radio Hall of Fame. Texas has benefited from his contributions to radio. We are very proud of him and this incredible accomplishment.

TRIBUTE TO LIEUTENANT COLONEL ROBERT J. FRIEND

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 2019

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Lieutenant Colonel Robert Jones Friend, who died on June 21, 2019 in Long Beach, California, surrounded by his family. Lieutenant Colonel Friend was a member of the heroic unit known as the Tuskegee Airmen during World War II.

Robert J. Friend was born on February 29, 1920, in Columbia, South Carolina, to William A. Friend and Nella Mae Jones Liner. His father was an immigrant from Ecuador and a veteran of World War I. The oldest of four children, Robert was an aviation enthusiast from a young age, often building model airplanes and reading stories of World War I pilots during his childhood. While studying at Lincoln University in Pennsylvania, he joined the Civilian Pilot Training Program where he earned his pilot's license in 1939.

Despite his passion for aviation, he was denied entry into flight training by the Army Air Force because of his race. Instead he joined as an air-cadet in the all-black 99th Pursuit Squadron, nicknamed the Tuskegee Airmen. During World War II, Lieutenant Colonel Friend flew 142 missions for the 322nd Fighter Group. He began his tour in North Africa and was later sent to the European Theater to serve as a Combat Operations Officer where he was instrumental in orchestrating tactical air missions. He specialized in flying the P-47 and P-51 Mustang aircraft. He experienced multiple death-defying disasters, including when he had to abandon his plane over the

mountains of Italy and when a German oil barge explosion nearly grounded his aircraft. He became the primary wingman to his commanding officer, Colonel Benjamin O. Davis, Jr., who would become the first black general in the Air Force. Robert and his fellow airmen were later awarded the Congressional Gold Medal for their service to our country.

After his service in World War II, Lieutenant Colonel Friend continued his education and received a degree in astrophysics from the Air Force Institute of Technology, later graduating from the University of California, Los Angeles Business School. Additionally, he continued his career in the military for 28 years by serving as an operations officer during the Korean and Vietnam wars, working on the Delta, Titan, and Atlas rocket programs, and operating as an executive of the aerospace companies, Stanford Mu and Fairchild Stratots. Following his retirement from military service, Robert started an aerospace company and conducted speaking engagements, remaining dedicated to sharing the legacy of the Tuskegee Airmen and keeping their history alive.

Robert J. Friend is survived by his children: Thelma Hoffman, Robert, Jr., Michael, Debra Carter, Karen Crumlich, Clara Ann Browning, 18 grandchildren, 32 great-grandchildren, and 14 great-great-grandchildren. The memory of his son, Darryl, who was killed while on active duty in 2002, continues to live on today.

It was my great honor to have known Lieutenant Colonel Friend, an intelligent, hard-working, and spirited man who spent his life in service to our country. I ask all members to join with me in remembering Lieutenant Colonel Robert Jones Friend, a true American hero.

FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

SPEECH OF

HON. KENDRA S. HORN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 2019

Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma. Madam Speaker, the U.S. Government is entrusted by the American people with certain responsibilities. One of these responsibilities is managing our government's finances and using taxpayer dollars wisely. In the last few decades, our government leaders have too often ignored this responsibility, opting rather to pay lip service to responsibly managing our budget but neglecting to do so in practice. This neglect has led to rampant spending, missed budgetary deadlines, and burdensome borrowing that have become mainstays of every Congress, regardless of which party holds the majority. The 116th Congress must take action to break this unsustainable cycle and restore the fiscal responsibility Americans have entrusted us with.

The 2019 GAO High-Risk List reveals that many federal government programs are over budget. This financial situation is not specific to one government agency or program. It can be found across the federal government. America must remain a world leader in many areas, such as scientific research, reliable infrastructure, and defense technology, and I understand that to do so requires large financial investments. However, it is also my responsibility as a Member of Congress to ensure the money our government spends is

being used effectively and efficiently so Americans are getting the most out of their hard-earned taxpayer dollars.

I have made it a priority to support legislation that addresses our government's spending habits. As a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I put forth a bipartisan amendment to the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) with fellow Oklahoman, Congressman TOM COLE, to allow the Department of Defense (DoD) to have better oversight of where and how government defense money is being spent. The amendment requires the office of the Inspector General to audit all sole-source contracts with depot maintenance centers. This audit, and other financial accounting tools, act as accountability measures to ensure the government is being a good steward of taxpayer money while keeping our country safe.

As a member of the Government Efficiency Caucus and the Blue Dog Coalition, I am constantly working with my colleagues to find ways to promote responsible government spending. The bipartisan Government Efficiency Caucus works to find pragmatic solutions to government spending that increase the efficiency and effectiveness of government programs. The Blue Dog Coalition's Fiscal Responsibility Task Force analyzes ways to strengthen our fiscal responsibility and close the cycle of widespread government spending.

During the 116th Congress, the Government Efficiency Caucus has identified three priorities to improve the government's fiscal efficiency. These priorities include focusing on ensuring government agencies adopt monetary best practices to increase efficiency and effectiveness; supporting reasonable policy proposals that will improve the on-time, on-budget delivery of federal infrastructure investments; and modernizing the federal government workforce to ensure government employees have the skills, knowledge, and technology, to be good stewards of taxpayer money.

The Blue Dog Coalition's Fiscal Responsibility Task Force has released a set of policy proposals that include financial stability measures like creating a federal rainy-day fund so Congress is less reliant on massive, unplanned emergency spending when disasters strike. Another proposal emphasizes a return to the regular process of creating and passing the federal budget on time every year. This proposal outlines concepts like "No Budget, No Pay" and "No Budget, No Recess," which would increase the consequences on Congress for not passing a federal budget on time. These and other proposals outlined by the Blue Dog Fiscal Responsibility Task Force should be given extensive consideration by Congress, so our government can correct the bad fiscal habits it has developed.

Future generations of Americans should not have to pay for our irresponsible spending. It is up to us to get America's fiscal house in order so we can prove to the world that we are a nation that keeps its fiscal promises. Doing so will not only improve our government and its standing in the world, but also increase the faith that taxpayers have in the government to spend their money wisely.

RECOGNIZING GERARDO BECERRA FOR HIS YEARS OF SERVICE TO THE INTERNATIONAL LONGSHOREMEN'S ASSOCIATION

HON. MARIO DIAZ-BALART

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 2019

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Speaker, on the occasion of his retirement as President of two local International Longshoremen's Association (ILA) chapters, I rise today to commemorate the years of service my close friend, Mr. Gerardo Becerra, has given to the maritime industry and the thousands of members he passionately represented in South Florida. Gerry is a remarkable individual whose legacy in the port industry and the ILA will never be forgotten.

Born in 1941 in Havana, Cuba, Gerry escaped the Castro dictatorship in 1960 and had to build a new life for himself in South Florida. Shortly after arriving to the states, Gerry enlisted in the United States Army in 1962 and served our nation for a number of years. After being honorably discharged from the army, Gerry began working at the ports and in 1965 he was one of the original charter members for ILA's Local 1922 chapter.

Gerry's retirement closes his chapter of over fifty-four years of service to the longshoremen industry and the ILA. From 1965 to 1983, Gerry worked as a checker and plan clerk and through his hard work and dedication, he was appointed Vice President in 1984 for Local 1922, Local 1922-1, and Local 2062. In this role, he represented checkers, mechanics, and truck drivers. In 2005, he became President of Local 1922 and Local 1922-1 and served in this position until his retirement. Additionally, he served as Vice President of the ILA from 2006 until 2018. During this time, Gerry was integral in negotiating contracts, mediating grievances, and representing the interests of his colleagues.

Having had the privilege of working with Gerry for many years, his determination and passion for bettering the longshoremen industry never wavered. While his retirement marks the end of an era, I have no doubt that Gerry looks forward to spending more time with his wife of fifty-six years, Carmen, his two daughters, nine grandchildren, and extended family.

Madam Speaker, I am honored to pay tribute to the impressive career of my dear friend, Mr. Gerry Becerra, and the strides he has made for the hardworking men and women in the port industry, and I ask my fellow colleagues to join me in recognizing this outstanding individual.

NABILA NAZEER EARNS STATE DEPARTMENT SCHOLARSHIP

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 2019

Mr. OLSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Nabila Nazeer of Travis High School in Richmond, TX, who was selected for a scholarship from the U.S. Department of State's Youth Ambassadors study abroad exchange program.

This highly competitive merit-based scholarship will give Nabila the opportunity to focus on civic education and leadership development projects during an exchange program to the Caribbean and South America. During this program, Nabila will develop her foreign language skills, increase her cross-cultural understanding, strengthening her leadership capacity and foster new academic insights and ambitions.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Nabila Nazeer on earning this prestigious scholarship.

IN RECOGNITION OF MR. MOHAMMAD SIDDIQUE SHEIKH'S 50 YEARS OF SERVICE TO THE COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA

HON. ROBERT J. WITTMAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 2019

Mr. WITTMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Mr. Mohammad Siddique Sheikh's nearly five decades of service to our great Commonwealth of Virginia.

Mr. Sheikh was born and raised in Gujranwala, Pakistan, before moving to the United States 50 years ago. He came with just \$10 dollars in his pocket, and today he is a very successful businessman living the American dream. Since moving to this country, Mr. Sheikh has served our country as a successful entrepreneur and advocate for the Pakistani American community in the larger Washington, D.C. metropolitan area. Mr. Sheikh has also been on several academic boards and business institutions, including George Mason University, one of Virginia's largest public research institutions. He is also the Founder of the Pakistan American Business Association (PABA), a representative body of entrepreneurs of Pakistani-origin. In recognition of his service and commitment, he was appointed as the Chairman of the Council on Diversity formed by the Police Chief of Fairfax County. He served in this position for more than five years.

Mr. Sheikh is a selfless and dedicated leader in the Pakistani American community. He has been a torch-bearer in promoting Pakistan's friendly image in the United States. Mr. Sheikh's servant leadership can be witnessed in his work when he helped create the Muslim Community Center in the state of Maryland and being a leading voice in the creation of Islamic Circle of North America Sunday School for Muslim communities residing in the DC metro area. In the education field, Mr. Sheikh has been a dominate force in promoting connections between higher institutions in Pakistan and the United States. As a member of the Board of Visitors at George Mason University and Pakistan's National University of Science of Technology, he led an effort to create opportunities for National University of Science and Technology faculty and students to study at George Mason University through various programs. He also played an active role in promoting cooperation between GMU and University of Karachi. Today, the two institutions are now working on various initiatives and programs.

Madam Speaker, I have had the privilege to know Mr. Sheikh for many years and count

him as a friend. I ask you to join me in recognition of Mr. Mohammad Siddique Sheikh leadership, passion, and determination in service to our great nation.

THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF
OREGON RARE PROGRAM

HON. PETER A. DeFAZIO

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 2019

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 25th anniversary of the University of Oregon Resource Assistance for Rural Environments (RARE) program. This AmeriCorps program is administered through the University of Oregon's Institute for Policy Research and Engagement and is dedicated to improving economic, social, and environmental conditions in rural Oregon communities.

Since its inception in 1994, more than 600 RARE members have served all 36 counties and more than half of the cities in Oregon, providing much needed capacity and expertise to rural communities. In the past 25 years, RARE members have completed more than 2,000 assessments, plans, and reports for local communities, written more than 700 grants, raised over \$6 million for communities, and recruited more than 10,000 community volunteers who served more than 8.6 million hours. In the last five years alone, communities in my congressional district have benefited from 37 projects and partnerships coordinated by the RARE AmeriCorps Program.

This year, 31 RARE members are working across the State of Oregon to develop and implement community planning, community and economic development, natural resource planning, and community food security/food systems projects. Current projects in my district include a RARE member working with the City of Florence Public Art Committee to select and install two large-scale public art pieces in the Urban Renewal District. There is also a two-year project with the Oregon Coast Visitors Association focused on community-driven initiatives for outdoor recreation, signature events, and culinary and agritourism-related opportunities on the southern Oregon coast.

I am proud to note that RARE AmeriCorps Program partnerships include federal and state agencies and notable non-profit foundations and organizations. The key partners are the Corporation for National & Community Service (AmeriCorps), the University of Oregon, the Ford Family Foundation, the Oregon Food Bank, Travel Oregon, Oregon Main Street, Energy Trust of Oregon, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, and the Oregon Department of Transportation.

It is my pleasure to congratulate the RARE AmeriCorps Program on 25 years of service to rural communities in Oregon and to thank RARE for its many vital contributions. I have no doubt these first 25 years of success will serve as the inspiration for the next twenty-five.

CONGRATULATING THE PEARLAND
HIGH SCHOOL BAND FOR BEING
SELECTED TO PERFORM IN THE
ROSE PARADE

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 2019

Mr. OLSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Pearland High School marching band, also known as "The Pride of Pearland," for being chosen to perform in the 131st annual Rose Parade.

The band was chosen for a number of reasons, most notably its member's community service efforts, specifically towards hurricane, Harvey relief. The band was one of 16 chosen out of over 100 national and international applicants and the only Texas band selected this year. In addition to community work, the bands are judged based on musicality and marching skills. The band also garnered community support to help raise the money funds needed to pay for the trip to Pasadena, California, for the parade.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to the Pearland marching band for being chosen to represent Texas at the historical Rose Parade. We are very proud of them and this incredible accomplishment.

CELEBRATING DR. EDNA REHBEIN

HON. JOHN R. CARTER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 2019

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life and work of Dr. Edna Rehbein, Assistant Vice-President for Academic Affairs at Texas State University, as she retires after 21 years of incredible public service. With her "can-do" spirit and high-minded vision, she's a model citizen and trusted community leader.

Renown for her expertise in Spanish and Spanish-American Literature, Edna has distinguished herself as a gifted educator and natural-born leader who has made a lasting impact on both her beloved university and the greater Round Rock, TX community. She's always shown tremendous respect and support for both students and colleagues while working tirelessly to make Texas State University Round Rock a world-class educational institution. She was the first director of the campus and started it from a program with just 5 classes that met at a local high school, to the program it is today with over 2,000 students and three state-of-the-art buildings on 101 acres in northeast Round Rock.

Outside of teaching, Edna contributes her expertise to various civic organizations in Central Texas. She represents Texas State University on community boards and organizations, including the Round Rock Chamber of Commerce, Economic Development Board, Round Rock ISD Partners in Education Board, and was a founding member of the Round Rock Arts Council. She is also on the Board of Trustees of her alma mater, Randolph (Macon Woman's) College, in Lynchburg, VA, and is active at King of King's Lutheran

Church. Her work to contribute her considerable energies to these worthy causes represent the best of Texas' generous spirit.

Dr. Edna Rehbein's retirement is the richly-deserved beginning of an exciting journey. I join her former students, colleagues, family, and friends in honoring her career, commending her commitment to education, and wishing my friend nothing but the best in the years ahead.

IN APPRECIATION OF THE WHITE
TANKS ROTARY CLUB AND
YOUTH4TROOPS

HON. PAUL A. GOSAR

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 2019

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my appreciation to the White Tanks Rotary Club and the Youth4Troops organization, who are coming together to prepare and package goods to be shipped to our service members deployed overseas and for homeless veterans.

This event brings together two groups dedicated to serving our military members and inspiring patriotism in fellow youth, and across generations by volunteering on behalf of service members and veterans everywhere. This event is intended as an expression of gratitude toward the many sacrifices that these military members make in defense of liberty in America and around the world. The White Tanks Rotary Club has made good on its mission to serve others, promote integrity and advance world understanding, goodwill, and peace.

I commend the participants, the White Tanks Rotary Club and Youth4Troops, for coordinating and hosting this event.

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE AND
CAREER OF AMBASSADOR
MARION H. SMOAK

HON. MICHAEL WALTZ

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 2019

Mr. WALTZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the service and career of Ambassador Marion H. Smoak as he celebrates his 103rd birthday. Ambassador Smoak has dedicated many years to public service and embodies the principles of a true servant leader.

Ambassador Smoak earned a bachelor's in English and History from The Citadel in 1938. He went on to receive a law degree from the University of South Carolina Law School in 1941. After receiving his law degree Ambassador Smoak served in the Army as a Judge Advocate and was stationed in Berlin, Germany and New Caledonia, Japan with the 11th and 82nd Airborne Divisions. Following his tour abroad, he became a law professor at the U.S. Military Academy at West Point.

Upon leaving his position at West Point, Ambassador Smoak continued to serve in the Army as a Legislative Liaison Officer right here in Washington, D.C. During his service, he assisted in drafting legislation and performed liaison duties both with Congress and

the Department of Justice, State, and Department of Defense. Ambassador Smoak then became Chief of the Legislative Drafting Division for the Judge Advocate General. He served as Chief until 1961 when he retired from the Army as a Lieutenant Colonel. Following his retirement, Ambassador Smoak continued to serve his community by pursuing elected office in the South Carolina State Senate.

Upon completing his term in the Senate, Ambassador Smoak was appointed to serve at the State Department as the Deputy Chief of Protocol, then Chief of Protocol for President Nixon. During this time Smoak was witness to many historic events of diplomacy. When he retired from the State Department in 1974, he was given the title of Ambassador. His storied career continued when he was named Co-Chairman on the Committee of Finance for then Presidential candidate Ronald Reagan. Ambassador Smoak went on to practice international law until his retirement.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating the career and lifelong servant leadership of Ambassador Smoak. It is with great pride that we thank him for his service and wish him continued health and happiness with his friends, family, and loved ones. Furthermore I hope that he may continue to enjoy his well-deserved daily martinis.

RECOGNIZING PRETRIAL, PROBATION AND PAROLE SUPERVISION WEEK OF 2019

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 2019

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, today, I rise to recognize the nation's community corrections professionals and the vital role they play in enhancing public safety throughout the United States. In honor of the invaluable contributions of these dedicated public servants, the American Probation and Parole Association (APPA) and its associated members have designated the week of July 21 through 27 "Pretrial, Probation and Parole Supervision Week 2019."

I thank the thousands of men and women who perform these important public safety duties and urge my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in support of APPA's week-long recognition efforts this year. Thousands of women and men in the nation's capital and across the country serve as pretrial, probation and parole officers or administrators. As public servants, they, along with many other Americans, commit themselves on a daily basis to helping improve the lives of those involved in the criminal justice system. The work of these professionals ultimately results in stronger and safer communities for all.

Community corrections professionals are responsible for the supervision of adult and juvenile offenders in communities throughout our nation. These trained professionals go above and beyond the call of duty by connecting their clients to supportive services, community-based resources, employment opportunities, housing programs and other evidence-based practices that help individuals successfully complete supervision and reenter society.

Community corrections professionals strive to provide these services and support, while simultaneously providing client surveillance, crime prevention and restorative justice.

In honor of Pretrial, Probation and Parole Supervision Week 2019, I take the opportunity to recognize those who carry out community corrections and supervision services especially in the District of Columbia, including the officers and professionals of the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency for the District of Columbia (CSOSA). CSOSA and the Pretrial Services Agency for the District of Columbia (PSA) are dedicated to reducing recidivism and enhancing public safety in the nation's capital. CSOSA and PSA are recognized as model community supervision entities because of their use of evidence-based practices and community partnerships. On any given day, CSOSA is responsible for supervising approximately 10,500 individuals on probation, parole or supervised release, while PSA supervises over 17,000 defendants over the course of a year. Charged with having to balance issues of public safety with social services and reentry support, the employees of CSOSA and PSA help to enhance the security of everyone who lives, works or visits the District.

Madam Speaker, again, I extend my gratitude to these public servants for their commitment, compassion and contributions to healthier and safer communities throughout the United States. I ask the House of Representatives to join me in acknowledging the impact community corrections professionals have on the quality of life of all Americans throughout our country by recognizing July 21 through 27 as Pretrial, Probation and Parole Supervision Week 2019.

HONORING YMCA YOUTH AND GOVERNMENT PROGRAM

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 2019

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I proudly honor the YMCA Youth and Government Program. Over the past 80 years, the YMCA Youth and Government Program has paved the way in creating the next generation of actively engaged leaders.

The national program invites young people from across the United States to participate in state-organized and model-government programs where they can participate in volunteering activities and get early exposure to practice governance and democracy. The program also provides the tools and resources to support all youth development through holistic programming. This program has played a crucial role in using the YMCA core values to cultivate a new generation of leaders.

My father, the late Donald M. Payne, was the first African American president of the National Council of YMCAs. He believed in the YMCA's mission to support our country's youth through mentorship opportunities. As someone who has participated in the YMCA Youth and Government Program, I actively support its mission of empowering young leaders to not only be active in their community, but also reshape the world.

Madam Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in honoring the YMCA Youth and Government Program.

HONORING HANK SCHREEDER

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 2019

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today with Representative JARED HUFFMAN to honor Hank Schreeder for his service as the Santa Rosa Chief of Police and thank him for his commitment to our community upon his retirement.

Chief Schreeder earned a Bachelor of Science in Administration of Criminal Justice from California State University Long Beach and a Master of Criminal Justice Program from the American Military University. He is also a graduate of the California Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training, the Supervisory Leadership Institute, and the Command College. In addition, Chief Schreeder was a leader in the development of Sonoma County's Family Justice Center and served as a member of the Chop's Teen Club Board.

During his time as Santa Rosa Chief of Police, Chief Schreeder increased transparency and worked to balance the needs of the community within budgetary limits. Chief Schreeder additionally bolstered community engagement by working with various community-based organizations to combat homelessness and develop long term solutions to the problem. Under Chief Schreeder's instrumental leadership, the Santa Rosa Police Department led a coordinated response to the October 2017 fires, drawing upon hundreds of officers from a mix of agencies to evacuate residents, find missing people, and patrol fire areas.

Madam Speaker, Chief Schreeder is an important member of our community and a true public servant. It is therefore fitting and proper that we honor Chief Schreeder here today.

EMMA SCHLOMANN EARNS GIRL SCOUT GOLD AWARD

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 2019

Mr. OLSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Emma Schломann of Katy, Texas for earning the Girl Scout Gold Award.

This is the highest award given to Girl Scouts and less than 5 percent achieve it. It is awarded to girls who develop and execute a project to make a lasting impact on an issue they are passionate about. Emma chose to do a Seizure Awareness campaign called "Project Caesar." This project is deeply personal to her as she was diagnosed with seizures almost 10 years ago. As part of her project, Emma created a six-minute informative video, which was sent to several school campuses in Katy ISD for teachers to show to students in their classrooms. She also gave a presentation to a group of 40 people to help spread awareness for seizure disorder. Emma received this Girl Scout Gold Award for her hard work and dedication to this project and her community.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again

to Emma Schломann for earning the prestigious Girl Scout Gold Award.

HONORING WILLIAM MAY

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 2019

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Madam Speaker, I pause to call attention to the upcoming retirement of a Missouri leader, advocate, legal scholar, and friend of small business.

For twenty years, Mr. William "Bill" May has served as executive director and general counsel at the Missouri Outdoor Advertising Association (MOAA). He will retire at the end of 2019.

An attorney, Bill May is considered an expert on regulation of out of home advertising in Missouri. His advice and counsel are sought by officeholders and staff, government officials, landowners, and billboard companies.

Bill began his career with Pioneer Outdoor Advertising in Springfield; he was promoted to general manager and general counsel. Soon after he assumed leadership of the Missouri Outdoor Advertising Association in 1999, voters faced an anti-billboard statewide ballot measure ("Proposition A") which was defeated on November 7, 2000.

Recognized nationally for his trade association leadership, Bill is an effective advocate for property rights, new technology, and common-sense flexibility for our state to save time and money in carrying out its regulatory duties.

As a supporter of law enforcement, I commend Bill and his colleagues in the billboard industry for partnerships to help find fugitives and missing persons and also deliver emergency information.

Please join me in congratulating Bill May and his wife Gail for their long service to Missouri and the out of home media industry.

IN HONOR OF NAMPA'S 25TH
ANNIVERSARY

HON. LANCE GOODEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 2019

Mr. GOODEN. Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD the following Proclamation:

Whereas, the North American Mature Publishers Association, Inc (NAMPA) is celebrating its 25th anniversary on October 13, 2019; and

Whereas, this prestigious association is holding its annual international convention and anniversary celebration in Memphis, Tennessee, where publishers, editors, staff, and guests of senior/boomer publications from across the United States and Canada will gather for educational and networking sessions; and

Whereas, NAMPA is a non-profit association of 96 member publications in 36 US States, and two Provinces in Canada with more than 4 million mature readers per month with its international headquarters located in Shreveport, Louisiana; and

Whereas, NAMPA's purpose and mission is to help magazines and newspapers that focus

on the mature market to improve their quality in terms of design and content, while also increasing revenue; and

Whereas, we wish to officially recognize and honor this outstanding association, its members, officers, and its current Executive Director, Gary L. Calligas, for their ongoing commitment to education and service to mature readers;

Now, therefore, we urge all citizens to support this milestone anniversary.

HONORING MR. ROBERT CLEMM

HON. SCOTT PERRY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 2019

Mr. PERRY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Robert Clemm, who has served actively for 60 continuous years with the Camp Hill Fire Company. Mr. Clemm joined the company in June of 1959. During his college years, he volunteered as a dispatcher. While he served as Assistant Fire Chief for many years, he now serves with the Fire Police. He has consistently distinguished himself over these 60 years through quiet leadership, ability, dedication and kindness. His efforts have improved fire safety not only in Camp Hill, but across the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Education has been a core part of Mr. Clemm's mission. While volunteering with the Fire Company, he earned his Bachelor's Degree in education from Millersville University of Pennsylvania and, in 1963, began a distinguished career as an award-winning industrial science teacher in the Big Springs School District.

Mr. Clemm used his skill as an educator to become a state-certified fire instructor for the Pennsylvania State Fire Academy. He taught advanced specialty classes, with topics including vehicle rescue, aerial operations, and methods for use of rural water supplies. When the Fire Academy faced budget troubles, he volunteered his time to ensure that Pennsylvania's firefighters would have the best training possible. He's also worked as an instructor in the Fire Science program at the Harrisburg Area Community College, where he helped to prepare future generations of fire instructors.

Mr. Clemm believes in teaching and preparing for the future, which not only makes him an effective teacher, but effective leader and mentor. His support, guidance, and inspiration to his fellow firefighters have spurred many to greater heights, strengthening the Company, ensuring its future, and improving the safety of the community.

After serving for decades as a firefighter, spending most of those years as Assistant Fire Chief, Mr. Clemm has moved on to support the Company's fire police operation. He's been instrumental in upgrading training for the fire police both locally and at the state level, and his insight has been invaluable as the Company acquired two fire police units.

On behalf of Pennsylvania's Tenth Congressional District, I extend my heartfelt congratulations and sincere gratitude to Mr. Robert Clemm for his selfless and tireless service to our community and Country.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ERIC SWALWELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 2019

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Madam Speaker, on June 28, I indicated how I would have voted on certain votes I missed that week. For three votes the wrong bill number is listed in the Record. To clarify, here is the correct information with respect to those votes:

Roll Call Vote Number 412 (Passing H. AMDT. 485 to H.R. 3351 offered by Rep. Eleanor Holmes Norton): Yes; Roll Call Vote Number 424 (Passing H.R. 3351, the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act, 2020): Yes; and, Roll Call Vote Number 429 (Agreeing to the Senate Amendment to H.R. 3401, the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for Humanitarian Assistance and Security at the Southern Border Act, 2019): No.

RECOGNIZING HAVEN MEGED OF
MILES CITY

HON. GREG GIANFORTE

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 2019

Mr. GIANFORTE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Haven Meged, of Miles City, for his outstanding success as a rookie on the rodeo circuit.

The Miles City native became involved in rodeo around the age of 11, and at 21, he is ranked in the top 10 in the world for tie-down roping. After his win at the College National Finals in June, he continues to take the American rodeo scene by storm.

With his mare named Beyoncé, Haven is working toward his goal "to be rookie of the year, qualify for the National Finals Rodeo, and win a gold buckle."

At Custer County High, Haven won over 10 high school rodeo championships before going on to be a true freshman roper in college. After his first year, he transferred to a renowned rodeo school in Texas.

At Tarleton State University, his professors and rodeo coaches work with him to balance his books and his rodeo career. As busy and successful as Haven has been, he continues to focus on his studies and tie downs.

Rodeo is part of our Montana way of life. While the Professional Rodeo Cowboys Association was founded in 1936, the roots of rodeo go back even further. During the summer, almost every city in Montana hosts a rodeo, either amateur or professional, making the cowboy sport a welcome sight. Hundreds of young men and women participate, carrying on the tradition of life on the cattle trail.

Madam Speaker, for his outstanding accomplishments as a young rodeo competitor, for his dedication to the Professional Rodeo Cowboys Association, and for preserving the American cowboy tradition, I recognize Haven Meged of Miles City for his spirit of Montana.

HONORING CARMEL MANOR

HON. THOMAS MASSIE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 2019

Mr. MASSIE. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor of Carmel Manor in Fort Thomas, KY. Carmel Manor has been providing care for seniors in the northern Kentucky community for 70 years.

Carmel Manor served its first residents in 1949 after the Diocese of Covington asked the Carmelite Sisters to administer the home. The Carmelite Sisters are united in and motivated by the belief that life is valuable from conception to its natural end. They understand it is hard to leave a loved one in the care of another, but the staff of Carmel Manor have proven they know how to care for the whole person—not just physical needs but spiritual, emotional, and social needs as well.

Throughout its history, Carmel Manor has worked to honor its residents' lives with compassion, dignity, and joy. They have achieved this by growing with the needs of their community.

Congratulations to Carmel Manor on their 70th anniversary. May they continue their mission to care in the years to come.

CHUCK BRAWNER RECEIVES LEADERSHIP AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AWARD**HON. PETE OLSON**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 2019

Mr. OLSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Chuck Brawner for being named a recipient of the Stan C. Stanley "Eagle" Leadership and Economic Development Award.

The Stan Stanley awards recognize a volunteer and elected official who have done their part to inspire leadership and economic growth in the Katy area. Mr. Brawner, mayor of the city of Katy, received the award in the elected official category for his dedication to our Katy community. Prior to being elected mayor in 2017, Mr. Brawner served as chief of police for the Spring Branch Independent School District Police Department. Our community is grateful for the forty years that he has dedicated to public service and law enforcement.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Mr. Brawner for this honor.

RECOGNIZING HILLSBOROUGH COMMUNITY COLLEGE FOR ITS 50TH ANNIVERSARY**HON. KATHY CASTOR**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 2019

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Hillsborough Community College (HCC) for its 50th anniversary. Since 1968, Hillsborough Community College

has provided the people of the Tampa Bay community with an affordable and quality education.

Ever since holding its first classes at Hillsborough High School in my hometown of Tampa, Florida, HCC has since grown to become an accredited institution serving over 44,000 students each year across 5 campuses and 3 training centers. HCC has expanded to offer 190 academic programs, ranging from Paralegal Studies to Engineering Technology. More than 84 percent of HCC graduates remain in Hillsborough County after graduation. Their contributions to our community are irreplaceable. HCC's graduates make Hillsborough County a better place.

HCC is a vibrant and diverse community with students of many different backgrounds. HCC also has been recognized as a Hispanic Serving Institution, meaning more than 25 percent of full-time HCC students are Hispanic or Latino. The 50th graduating class included students aged 16 to 72 years old. To celebrate the diversity of their campuses and encourage retention, in 2006 HCC hosted its first Annual Black, Brown & College Bound (BBCB) Summit. The Summit brings accomplished professionals and scholars together with Black and Latino male students to discuss barriers that affect persistence and completion among minority males. In its 13th year, BBCB has grown nationally to include more than 150 different colleges and universities from 40 states.

HCC has is not just be an institution of higher learning, but part of the fabric of our community—hosting events such as a hearing of the United States Senate on small, premium cigar businesses in the college's Cigar City campus, forums to address the persistence of sexual harassment in the workplace and enrollment events for the Affordable Care Act to expand health care coverage to our most vulnerable neighbors.

Hillsborough Community College plays a critical role in preparing young students for promising futures in the workforce. I applaud HCC's success in preparing students for continued education and professional careers. I am eager to see where HCC's next 50 years will lead students in the Tampa Bay community.

IN MEMORY OF THEODORE J.
"TED" PLAMONDON, JR.

HON. JOE COURTNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 2019

Mr. COURTNEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the life and service of Theodore J. "Ted" Plamondon, Jr. Teddy was a constituent of mine from Enfield, CT. He passed away last Tuesday at the age of 93.

Ted was born and raised in Enfield. He worked as a police officer and served as Hartford County sheriff, state marshal, and town constable. Additionally, he served for 22 years in the U.S. Navy and Navy Reserve throughout World War II, the Korean War, and the war in Vietnam. Consequently, it should come as no surprise that Teddy was the biggest advocate for veterans Enfield has ever seen. He organized both the Memorial Day and Veterans Day parades every year, was chairman of the Enfield Veterans Council, and was in-

involved with AMVETS Post 18, VFW Post 1501, and the John Maciolek American Legion Post 154. He was also instrumental in securing a new World War II monument in town. And, as if all that weren't enough, he was an active member of the Democratic Town Committee.

As a testament to Teddy's popularity and how deeply beloved he was by his community, Enfield residents took turns keeping constant vigil at his bedside as he ailed.

Madam Speaker, I had the privilege of knowing Ted Plamondon for over twenty years from his involvement in the court system, local politics and tireless veteran advocacy. He was outspoken, and you always knew where he stood—even if it meant ruffling feathers. Enfield, the town he loved, lost a devoted citizen whose life embodied public service. It was a privilege to know him and call him a friend. I ask my colleagues to join me in extending sincerest condolences to Ted's surviving family, for their loss.

HONORING WBA SUPER BANTAM-WEIGHT CHAMPION RONNY RIOS**HON. J. LUIS CORREA**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 2019

Mr. CORREA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor lifelong Santa Ana resident and the WBA Super Bantamweight Champion of the World, Ronny Rios.

Ronny was born in Compton, California and his family moved to Santa Ana when he was just a toddler. Ronny grew up in Santa Ana and attended Monroe Elementary School, McFadden Intermediate School and graduated from Saddleback High School, where he was a proud Roadrunner.

Ronny was introduced to boxing at the age of 13, when he joined the local boxing club, TKO Boxing. Ronny immediately demonstrated talent in the sport and became one of the top prospects at TKO Boxing.

Ronny began to make a name for himself as an amateur boxer. He was a finalist in the Olympic Trials, narrowly missing a spot on the 2008 Olympic Team. He was a two-time U.S. Amateur National Champion and national Golden Gloves Champion. Ronny was one of the most decorated amateurs to hit the boxing scene in many years.

In 2009, Ronny made the step to become a professional boxer and signed with Golden Boy Promotions, the boxing promotion company run by legendary boxer Oscar De La Hoya.

As a professional boxer, Ronny racked up an impressive list of wins, going 23–0 in his first 5 years as a professional with 12 knockouts. He scored NABF and WBA Silver Championships and sought a world champion title.

After a couple of losses, Ronny went into semi-retirement in early 2018, choosing to enter a career in real estate. A year later, Ronny returned to the sport to take one last shot at a title. The comeback began with a win over Daniel Olea on April 26.

Ronny's next fight was for a title was against the undefeated Diego De La Hoya, cousin of Oscar De La Hoya, and a rising star in the sport of boxing. Ronny was considered the underdog.

The two faced off at Dignity Health Sports Park in Carson on July 13, 2019 for the titles of NABF Super Bantamweight and the WBA Super Bantamweight Champion. In an ending that could be written for a movie, Ronny completed his comeback and achieved his dream of a world title with a 6-round knockout of De La Hoya, who suffered his first loss.

With this win, Ronny was crowned the NABF Super Bantamweight Title and the WBA Super Bantamweight Champion. Ronny Rios has truly made Santa Ana and America proud. Please join me in recognizing world boxing champion and my constituent, Ronny Rios.

HIGHLIGHTING THE IMPORTANCE OF THE MANUFACTURING LEADERSHIP ACT

HON. TOM REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 2019

Mr. REED. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my support for the Manufacturing USA Programs, the Manufacturing Institutes and their role in advancing U.S. Manufacturing.

These programs are the only ones of their kind in this country designed to bring business partners together in full collaboration, built to foster communities of innovators and entrepreneurs, and equipped to move specific new technologies into the manufacturing mainstream. We need these types of communities to propel advanced manufacturing out of the research labs and into the marketplace. The United States is a global leader in scientific and engineering research, but we are lagging in taking that research into the marketplace. The Manufacturing USA program has shown that the time to market can be greatly reduced in the right environment.

In the four short years of their existence, 14 Manufacturing Institutes have entered separate technology areas key to our future competitiveness. The partners in these institutes contribute matching funds equal to or greater than the government share. At the end of 2017, the matching funds were already being invested at \$1.50 for every \$1 investment from the federal government, speaking to the enthusiasm of the industry participation.

More importantly, 844 manufacturing firms and 297 educational institutions were participating in the collective institutes along with 150 other entities, such as state and local governments.

In the years since that report, the Manufacturing USA program has reached a spending match of \$2 for every \$1 of federal funding, with 1,300 member organizations across the institutes, supporting 270 major collaborative industry-led R&D projects, and offered training opportunities for more than 200,000 people.

As a result, global competition in the manufacturing sector is growing tremendously. Several of our international competitors have focused government-supported efforts to develop their industrial sectors and commercialization strategies.

The European Union's Horizon 2020 program invested 80 billion Euros in funding over 7 years and a follow-on program is in development.

Germany's Fraunhofer Society, established in 1949, currently includes 72 institutes fo-

cused on applied research and development across various technology domains relevant to manufacturing. In 2017, the Fraunhofer Society budget totaled about \$2.6 billion, with about \$2.25 billion in contract research. 30 percent of this budget comes from government funds, and 70 percent from private.

China has set advancing manufacturing as one of their six top priorities and is on the path to opening 40 manufacturing institutes by 2025. The country is following the plan set by the Manufacturing USA program.

Korea (a country less than 1/6 the size of the USA) is spending \$291M on the Korea Institute of Industrial Technology (KIIT), established in 1989 to strengthen their small and mid-sized manufacturing base.

The list goes on: Japan, Singapore, the UK, and others are all heavily investing in manufacturing.

This is why The Manufacturing USA program is so important—because it is our best effort to respond strategically as a nation to this mounting competition. The program allows the United States to focus its resources on high-value industries and ensure future leadership around the globe.

In December 2017, the White House published a National Security Strategy of the United States which states, "Economic security is national security" and calls out the need to lead in research, technology, invention, and innovation.

In response, the National Institute of Standards and Technology reached out to our countrymen and women and reported on how we can better come together as a country and make use of our government investments. They reported 5 strategies to transfer the results of Federal research and development investments to the benefit of our country's commercial, economic, and national security interests. This report is the most extensive of its kind to explore the value of Federal US research investments.

Furthermore, the Manufacturing USA program is uniquely positioned to address and is addressing the following 4 strategies: Private sector engagement, Entrepreneurial workforce, Tools and services for technology transfer, and Understanding of global science and technology trends and benchmarks.

The groundwork for this program has been laid. The strategy for supporting our industrial base and securing our economic future has been thought through. We must continue our support for this program to safeguard our continued prosperity. I urge you all to support this bill to extend the term of federal funding for the Manufacturing USA program and to expand on the government-private partnerships operating under the program.

DICK PHILLIPS RECEIVES LEADERSHIP AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AWARD

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 2019

Mr. OLSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dick Phillips for being named a recipient of the Stan C. Stanley "Eagle" Leadership and Economic Development Award.

The Stan Stanley awards recognize a volunteer and elected official who have done their

part to inspire leadership and economic growth in the Katy area. Mr. Phillips, University of Houston Vice President of Community Engagement, received the award in the volunteer category. He was crucial in recruiting the University of Houston Victoria and the University of Houston Katy campus to the Katy area. This accomplishment is creating jobs and opportunities for the hard-working individuals in our community.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations to Mr. Phillips. We wish him the best of luck on his future endeavors on behalf of Katy, TX.

STOP CRUELTY TO MIGRANT CHILDREN ACT

HON. GRACE MENG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 2019

Ms. MENG. Madam Speaker, I rise to emphasize the urgent need to assist migrant children at our Southern land border. The Trump Administration's treatment of asylum-seeking families at the border is un-American and inhumane.

There have been over 2,500 children separated from their families at our border. Of the 2,500, 1,033 were under the age of ten when they were detained, including 103 that were under five. Last year, I traveled to Texas to see the conditions first-hand. At the McAllen CBP Central Processing Center, I saw children being kept in large cages, most separated from their parents. At the Port Isabel ICE Detention Center, I cried with mothers who had their children taken away from them.

A year later and there are still serious overcrowding and prolonged detention of unaccompanied migrant children. At Rio Grande Valley, 826 of the 2,669 children detained had been held longer than the 72 hours generally permitted under the current CBP standards and the Flores Agreement. Furthermore, children had no access to showers and had not been provided hot meals.

Madam Speaker, no child should have to endure the conditions of the Trump administration's anti-immigrant rhetoric, regardless of their immigration status. UNHCR's High Commissioner for Human Rights, Michelle Bachelet, herself said she was "deeply shocked that children are forced to sleep on the floor in overcrowded facilities, without access to adequate healthcare or food, and with poor sanitation conditions." Detention is never in the best interest of any child—and it is heartbreaking to know that these children may have serious damage to their health and development as a result of this Administration's shameful practice.

This is why I am introducing the "Stop Cruelty to Migrant Children Act". This the bill would:

End family separations except in situations where the child is a trafficking victim, not the child of the accompanying adult, or in danger of abuse or neglect.

Set minimum health and safety standards for children and families in Border Patrol Stations; require access to toothbrushes, diapers, soap and showers and other hygiene products; require regular nutritious meals; and ensure a prompt medical assessment by trained medical providers.

End for-profit contractors from operating new Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) standard shelters or influx facilities. Such shelters or facilities must be state-licensed, meet Flores Settlement Agreement standards, and not used to house children indefinitely.

Expand alternatives to detention and the successful Family Case Management Program (FCMP), which was a program that was designed to increase compliance with immigration obligations through a comprehensive case management strategy supported by community organizations.

Remove roadblocks to placing unaccompanied children with sponsors by lowering the total number of cases a manager may take, mandating lower staffing ratios, and ending the information sharing agreement between ORR and Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE).

Ensure unaccompanied children have access to legal counsel and continue to be placed in a safe setting for their initial asylum case review.

Provide resources to non-profit centers that are helping provide humanitarian assistance.

Permit Members of Congress, accompanying staff, and credentialed press (without cameras) to visit any facility with 24-hour notice.

We need to ensure that our government funds must not be used to traumatize or harm asylum seekers. The Trump administration's lack of empathy and compassion for migrant families and children at the U.S.-Mexico border is heartbreaking and demands action by Congress. Those who come to our nation should be treated with dignity and respect and that is something the administration has failed to provide when treating migrant families. We have a crisis at the southern border, and we need to ensure our officials have the resources they need while respecting the dignity of those in the U.S. government's care. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and join me in the fight to protect children's human rights.

IN RECOGNITION OF JOHN
FARRITOR'S 100TH BIRTHDAY

HON. MIKE LEVIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 2019

Mr. LEVIN of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 100th birthday of veteran and integral part of the San Diego and Camp Pendleton communities, John Farritor.

John was born on July 9, 1919 in Broken Bow, Nebraska. At the age of 13, John dropped out of school to run his family's 720-acre hay farm. Although he wanted to enlist after Germany invaded Poland in 1939, he waited a year to help his mother at the ranch before joining the Marines.

John started boot camp at the Marine Corps Recruit Depot in San Diego in July 1941 and was later stationed at Camp Pendleton as a member of the 3rd Marine Division Field Artillery. John is one of the few surviving Marines who marched 55 miles from Camp Elliot to the newly opened Camp Pendleton in Oceanside in September 1942.

John's division played a crucial role in several battles in the Pacific, including the battle

to liberate Guam and the battle of Iwo Jima. He remembers watching his fellow soldiers raising the American flag after the battle of Iwo Jima. The morning after the battle, he rose at dawn to make sure the flag was still flying over the hill.

John continued his service after the war and joined the 11th Marine Regiment, 1st Battalion at Camp Pendleton. He served in the Korean War, where he received a wound to the hand from flying shrapnel. Despite his years of service, he has refused a Purple Heart and does not like being called a war hero. He says that "all of the real heroes were buried over there."

During his 30 years of service in the Marines, he rose from the rank of private to first sergeant. He documented his experiences in his memoir *Through It All: Stories from the Top*, published in 2001.

John Farritor has lived an incredible and full life. He is a true inspiration for our community, and we cannot thank him enough for his service to his country and to Camp Pendleton.

John Farritor celebrated his birthday on July 9 with friends and family in Vista, California. I am honored to pay tribute to John, and I wish him a very happy 100th birthday.

HANNA TEERMAN EARNS STATE
DEPARTMENT SCHOLARSHIP

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 2019

Mr. OLSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Hanna Teerman of Cinco Ranch High School in Katy, TX, who was selected for a scholarship from the U.S. Department of State's National Security Language Initiative for Youth.

This highly competitive merit-based scholarship will give Hanna the opportunity to live overseas in language immersion program to acquire skills that are critical to U.S. national security. During this program, Hanna will develop her foreign language skills, increase her cross-cultural understanding, strengthening her leadership capacity and foster new academic insights and ambitions.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Hanna Teerman on earning this prestigious scholarship.

RAISE THE WAGE ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. ROBERT C. "BOBBY" SCOTT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 2019

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the following letters in support of H.R. 582, Raise the Wage Act: International Brotherhood of Teamsters; National Urban League; Disability Coalition; Health Care Groups; Interreligious Working Group on Domestic Human Needs; First Focus Campaign for Children; Network Lobby for Catholic Social Justice; Americans for Democratic Action; and National Employment Lawyers Association.

INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD

OF TEAMSTERS,

July 16, 2019.

*U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: This week, the House of Representatives will take up H.R. 582, the Raise the Wage Act of 2019. The International Brotherhood of Teamsters urges you to vote for H.R. 582.

Income inequality is on an alarming trajectory and continues to rise unabated. Neither record-breaking corporate profits nor increased productivity have reversed or slowed this trend. This is not the kind of economy we should be building. The Raise the Wage Act is essential to bringing some measure of fairness and justice to workers who toil at the lower-end of the wage scale. It is an important step we can take to address growing pay inequality. An increase in the federal minimum wage, which has not increased since 2009, is long overdue.

H.R. 582 would raise the federal minimum wage from \$7.25 to \$15.00 per hour by 2024. It would increase the minimum wage to \$8.55 this year, with increases over the subsequent six years. After 2024, the minimum wage would be indexed to median wage growth to ensure that its value does not erode.

Finally, the bill would remedy an egregious situation that has gone on for far too long. The bill would phase out the subminimum wage for tipped workers, which has been frozen at a paltry \$2.13 per hour for more than 20 years. And, it would end the subminimum wage for workers with disabilities employed in sheltered workshops and for workers under age 20.

No one who works hard and plays by the rules should live in poverty. Much is said about valuing work, and about respecting work. If we truly value work, if we truly respect work, the House will pass H.R. 582, the Raise the Wage Act of 2019.

Again, the Teamsters Union urges a yes vote on H.R. 582.

Sincerely,

JAMES P. HOFFA,

General President.

NATIONAL URBAN LEAGUE

WASHINGTON BUREAU,

July 15, 2019.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: As President and CEO of the National Urban League, I am writing to express our strong support for immediate passage of the Raise the Wage Act of 2019 (H.R. 582). Raising the minimum wage to \$15/hour is a key provision of the National Urban League's Main Street Marshall Plan, a bold and comprehensive plan for lifting urban communities out of poverty and stimulating their economic growth.

The National Urban League has been in every fight to raise the minimum wage. While the road from poverty to plenty is long, raising the federal minimum wage from \$7.25 to \$15/hour is an important and long overdue first step in lifting millions of families out of poverty and giving them a chance at a better life. No one—absolutely no one—who works full time should ever live in poverty. Yet, according to the Economic Policy Institute (EPI), one in nine U.S. workers are paid wages that can leave them in poverty, even when working full-time and year-round. Raising the minimum wage to \$15 would have a major impact on people of color. According to research, 38.1 percent of Black workers and 33.4 percent of Hispanic workers would get a raise if the federal minimum wage were increased to \$15.

We applaud the Raise the Wage Act of 2019 because it is a comprehensive minimum wage bill that would positively impact workers on different levels. H.R. 582 would:

Gradually raise the federal minimum wage from \$7.25 to \$15 over the next six years to

lift millions of workers out of poverty, stimulate local economies, and restore the value of minimum wage;

Index future increases in the federal minimum wage to median wage growth to ensure the value of minimum wage does not once again erode over time;

Guarantee tipped workers are paid at least the full federal minimum wage by repealing the subminimum wage for tipped workers, which will ensure consistent, livable pay;

Guarantee teen workers are paid at least the full federal minimum wage by repealing the rarely used subminimum wage for youth workers; and

End subminimum wage certificates for individuals with disabilities to provide opportunities for individuals with disabilities to be competitively employed, taxpaying citizens and participate more fully in their communities.

Putting more money in the pockets of working Americans who will reinvest in our economy on things like groceries and housing will boost the economy from the bottom up and create real and sustainable job growth.

The federal minimum wage has not been increased since 2009. A decade is more than enough time for our nation's leaders to right this unjustifiable inequity. Let's get this done now. It's time for Congress to do the right—and smart—thing by working Americans. The National Urban League looks forward to working with you to get the Raise the Wage Act of 2019 enacted into law this year.

Sincerely,

MARC H. MORIAL,
President and CEO,
National Urban League.

CPSD, NATIONAL DISABILITY
RIGHTS NETWORK,
July 11, 2019.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The undersigned organizations understand that the Raise the Wage Act of 2019 will soon come up for a vote before the full House. We unequivocally believe that any minimum wage bill must include ALL people, including people with disabilities. We strongly support the inclusion of the phase out of subminimum wages to people with disabilities, currently legal under Section 14(c) of the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA), in the Raise the Wage Act and urge you to vote against any amendments that would leave people with disabilities out of this important bill.

Employment of people with disabilities has long been a bi-partisan national goal. The Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) of 2014 established as a priority competitive integrated employment, where people with disabilities work in mainstream jobs alongside, and are paid comparable wages to, co-workers without disabilities. WIOA furthers the goal of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) to advance the economic self-sufficiency of people with disabilities.

Yet, despite the clear national priority for competitive integrated employment, nearly 230,000 people with disabilities are legally paid sub-minimum wages under Section 14(c) of FLSA, largely in settings where they are segregated from their nondisabled peers and broader society. The subminimum wage creates and reinforces a life of poverty and dependency on public support. In hearings before this Congress, expert witnesses have testified that ending subminimum wages is a civil rights issue and that phasing out Section 14(c) is a critical component of any federal minimum wage bill.

As the Congressionally-created federal Advisory Committee on Increasing Competitive Integrated Employment for Individuals with

Disabilities ("the Committee") described in its report to Congress and the Labor Secretary:

[There is an] underlying need to amend Section 14(c) of the FLSA so that it reflects and aligns with modern federal disability policy and laws, which are based on the assumption that all individuals with disabilities are capable of, and have a right to, [competitive integrated employment]. The current widespread practice of paying workers subminimum wages, based on assumptions that people with disabilities cannot work in typical jobs, or on assumptions about the unavailability of alternative work opportunities, is antithetical to the intent of modern federal policy and law.

The National Council on Disability, an independent federal agency charged with advising the President, Congress, and other federal agencies regarding policies that impact people with disabilities, has repeatedly called for the elimination of sub-minimum wages under Section 14(c), including in its recent report, "National Disability Employment Policy, From the New Deal to the Real Deal: Joining the Industries of the Future."

The inclusion of the 14(c) phase out in the Raise the Wage Act sends a clear message to the public that it is no longer acceptable to pay individuals with disabilities less than the minimum wage. The undersigned organizations stress again the necessity that the Raise the Wage Act of 2019 retain the phase out of the use of 14(c) certificates and bring an end to this blatantly discriminatory practice which allows for the payment of subminimum wages to people with disabilities.

Sincerely,

American Association of People with Disabilities, Association of People Supporting Employment First, Association of University Centers on Disabilities, Autistic Self Advocacy Network, Bazelon Center for Mental Health Law, Center for Public Representation, Collaboration to Promote Self Determination, Disability Rights Education and Defense Fund.

National Association of Councils on Developmental Disabilities, National Association for Rights Protection and Advocacy, National Council on Independent Living, National Disability Institute, National Disability Rights Network, National Down Syndrome Congress, National Organization on Disability, TASH.

July 3, 2019.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SCOTT: The undersigned organizations are writing to express our support for the Raise the Wage Act of 2019 (H.R. 582). The Act would raise the federal minimum wage from \$7.25 to \$15.00 an hour over a six-year period, after which the minimum wage would be indexed to median wages. Our organizations believe that raising the federal minimum wage will significantly contribute to improving quality of care and quality of life for nursing home residents across the country.

According to the Paraprofessional Healthcare Institute (PHI), nursing assistants earn a median wage of \$12.84 an hour and a median income of \$21,200 a year. Nursing assistants' inflation-adjusted wages have only increased six cents in the past 10 years, meaning that "while goods and services increased in price, the purchasing power of nursing assistant wages did not meaningfully increase in the past decade." Since nursing assistants (37 percent) rely on some form of public assistance, federal and state governments subsidize the nursing home industry by compensating for their workers' low wages. Unfortunately, the data suggest that a profession in caring for the country's most vulnerable individuals may lead to poverty.

Given the hardships involved with being a direct care worker, it is not surprising to learn that these positions cannot compete with less demanding and higher paying jobs, such as those in the fast food and retail industries. This strain on the nursing home workforce is supported by a recently published study in *The Gerontologist*, which indicates that periods of low unemployment (like the one the country is currently experiencing) result in nursing home workers looking for jobs outside of the industry. The report finds that high unemployment makes nursing home work more attractive and leads to better care for nursing home residents, noting that a 5.6 percentage point increase in the unemployment rate decreases deficiencies and would result in lower rates of pressure ulcers, physical restraints use, and weight loss.

Economic recessions should not dictate whether residents have access to quality of care and quality of life. The federal Nursing Home Reform Law requires every facility to provide services that allow residents to attain or maintain their "highest practicable physical, mental, and psychosocial well-being." Unfortunately, as the study above highlights, low wages continue to place residents at risk of experiencing higher rates of harm. A 2015 report by the Keystone Research Center further adds that high rates of staff turnover, most often attributed to low wages, disrupt staff-resident relationships and cause "the loss of a valuable source of information about resident well-being." As one nursing home worker explains in the report, "the work is just too hard for such low pay . . . many are either ready to walk away from the work or are thinking hard about doing so . . . Raising my wage to \$15 would . . . really change the way I think about my job."

Improving the experiences of nursing home workers is critical in light of the growing need for direct care workers in the coming years. PHI reports that, "by 2050, the population of adults aged 65 and above—who comprise 83 percent of the nursing home resident population—is expected to nearly double, from 47.8 million (in 2015) to 88 million." Additionally, the number of adults 85 years old and above (40 percent of residents) "is expected to more than triple over the same period from 6.3 million to 19 million." Continuing to pay our direct care workers low, uncompetitive wages for physically and emotionally difficult jobs will only place greater strain on resident care.

Our organizations thank you for taking this step to increase the federal minimum wage and making it easier for nursing home workers to provide care to our nation's most vulnerable individuals. The Raise the Wage Act gives both nursing home workers and residents the hope of a better life.

Sincerely,

Center for Medicare Advocacy, Justice in Aging, Long Term Care Community Coalition, National Association of Social Workers, Service Employees International Union (SEIU), The National Consumer Voice for Quality Long-Term Care, Women's Institute for a Secure Retirement.

DHN INTERRELIGIOUS WORKING
GROUP ON DOMESTIC HUMAN
NEEDS,

June 28, 2019.

DEAR MEMBER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: The undersigned faith-based advocacy and religious organizations urge House leadership and members to advance the Raise the Wage Act of 2019 (H.R. 582) without further delay. The bill passed through committee months ago and is languishing as desperate workers wait for relief. We are deeply concerned about the plight of

our sisters and brothers who work hard but are still struggling to make ends meet. Inflation and rising prices have made the financial squeeze on low-wage workers unbearable. This bill offers a partial remedy to those in most desperate need. Its urgency warrants full consideration by the chamber without further delay. It is time for members to demonstrate that the financial security of workers is a priority in the House.

We come from a variety of faith perspectives, but our moral principles and faith traditions all affirm the need to promote human dignity by prioritizing vulnerable communities and individuals in need. Our faith traditions teach us that justice requires that every worker earn enough to provide a standard of living in accordance with their God-given dignity. The current federal minimum wage of \$7.25/hour and \$2.10/hour for tipped workers is woefully insufficient and has remained stagnant for the longest period in the history of our nation. This disregard is a shameful statement of neglect for those most in need in our society.

Passage of the Raise the Wage Act of 2019 would demonstrate to these workers relegated to a life of poverty that they are, in fact, valued as individuals and as members of society. The provisions of the Raise the Wage Act take substantive steps to ensure people earn wages that are enough to support themselves. Moving towards a universal wage floor of \$15 an hour is on-par with historical minimum wage rates and responds to the real cost of living everywhere in the nation. Phasing out the outdated subminimum wage for tipped workers, workers under the age of 20, and those with disabilities is just and is long overdue. Moreover, an annually adjusted minimum wage based on the nation's median hourly wages would curtail the growing pay inequality between the lowest-paid workers and the middle-class.

Our families and our economy have been increasingly burdened by wage stagnation and income inequality. The Raise the Wage Act of 2019 would immediately lighten this burden by gradually raising the wage floor to broadly impact those at the bottom of the workforce. According to policy experts, more than 1 in 4 workers would be impacted by this legislation, 90 percent of whom are over the age of 20. Estimates project that low-income earners would make an additional \$3,000 a year, on average, for those working year-round. The difference that makes for a preschool teacher, bank teller, or fast-food worker who struggles to get by on around \$20,000 per year would be remarkable. The Raise the Wage Act will particularly benefit women and people of color, who are disproportionately represented among low-wage workers. Additionally, this legislation corrects the harmful and exploitative practice of under-paying individuals with disabilities by recognizing the value of their work and paying them accordingly.

The time for the Raise the Wage Act. is long overdue. Just this month, we marked the shameful milestone of the longest period in U.S. history without a federal minimum wage increase. Justice cannot wait; and neither can Americans who labor every day with insufficient pay. The faith community calls on Leadership to schedule a floor vote on this important piece of legislation immediately. We also urge members of the House of Representatives to pass the Raise the Wage Act free of any degrading amendments which would undermine the law's benefits for poor workers.

Sincerely,

American Friends Service Committee; Bread for the World; Church World Service; Central Conference of American Rabbis; Conference of Superiors of Men (Catholic); Congregation of Our Lady of the Good Shepherd,

US Provinces; Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, St. Louis Province; Disciples Center for Public Witness (Disciples of Christ); Disciples Refugee & Immigration Ministries; Ecumenical Poverty Initiative.

Evangelical Lutheran Church in America; Faith in Public Life; Franciscan Action Network; Friends Committee on National Legislation; Interfaith Worker Justice; Jesuit Conference—Office of Justice and Ecology; Jewish Council for Public Affairs; Leadership Conference of Women Religious; Missionary Oblates of Mary Immaculate; National Advocacy Center of the Sisters of the Good Shepherd.

National Council of Churches; National Council of Jewish Women; NETWORK Lobby for Catholic Social Justice; Pax Christi USA; Poligon Education Fund; Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.); The United Methodist Church—General Board of Church and Society; Union for Reform Judaism; Unitarian Universalist Association; United Church of Christ Justice and Witness Ministries; Women of Reform Judaism.

FIRST FOCUS
CAMPAIGN FOR CHILDREN,
July 12, 2019.

Hon. ROBERT "BOBBY" SCOTT,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. MARK POCAN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. STEPHANIE MURPHY,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SCOTT, CONGRESSMAN POCAN, and CONGRESSWOMAN MURPHY: On behalf of First Focus Campaign for Children, a bipartisan advocacy organization dedicated to making children and families the priority in federal policy and budget decisions, I would like to express our support for the Raise the Wage Act of 2019 (H.R. 582) and urge all members of the House of Representatives to vote yes in support of this legislation.

As an organization committed to ensuring the economic security of children and families in the United States, we applaud efforts to raise the minimum wage to \$15 an hour by 2024. Nationwide, 17.5 percent of children are living in families with incomes below the poverty line. At its current rate, a parent making minimum wage and working full-time cannot earn enough to pay market rent or lift his or her family out of poverty. Children in the U.S. are disproportionately affected by these low wages, and are 62 percent more likely to live in poverty than adults.

A recent landmark study from the National Academy of Sciences confirms that raising the federal minimum wage decreases child poverty. Written by a nonpartisan committee of the nation's leading experts on child poverty, *A Roadmap to Reducing Child Poverty* finds that income poverty directly causes negative outcomes to child well-being, yet when yet when a poor household receives additional income, such as from an increase to the minimum wage, parents and guardians are enabled to provide resources that have long-term positive impacts on a child's health and economic contributions.

According to the Economic Policy Institute, the new wage proposed would give higher pay to 41 million workers, 28 percent of which have children to support. This would mean the parents of over 11 million children would be empowered to support their child's healthy development with critical resources such as nutritious food, health care, adequate shelter, warm clothing, and educational materials.

Parents who live in a constant state of financial instability and struggle to provide

enough resources for their children often suffer from stress, anxiety, and depression, making it more difficult to respond to their children's emotional needs. Increased income therefore promotes financial stability, improves the physical and mental health of children and families and in turn, reduces child maltreatment rates.

The Raise the Wage Act of 2019 is both an important step towards improving economic stability for 11 million children and a vital investment in the future of our country. We are grateful for your leadership in making children and families a legislative priority, and we look forward to working with you on this and other proposals to improve the well-being of children and youth.

Sincerely,

BRUCE LESLEY,
President

NETWORK LOBBY FOR CATHOLIC
SOCIAL JUSTICE,

July 15, 2019.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: NETWORK Lobby for Catholic Social Justice urges a yes vote on H.R. 582, the Raise the Wage Act of 2019. In the spirit of the Gospel, we promote a just society which ensures that all people are able to live dignified lives. Catholic Social Justice tells us that a just wage is the central indicator and "the most concrete means of verifying justice" within a fair, functioning, and flourishing economic system. In 2019 in the richest nation in the world, minimum wage workers are groaning and crying out under their financial burdens.

Surviving on \$7.25 an hour anywhere in the country is a bitter, harsh reality; supporting dependents or a family on this wage is impossible. Workers who are one work accident, job loss, or family illness away from economic disaster are so vulnerable—and they are the backbone of our nation. There is a covenant between labor and capital that is part of our nation's history of progress: full time work should be enough to keep families out of poverty. Today we find low wage earners working 2 or even 3 jobs to make ends meet. It is morally reprehensible that millions of people work full time, yet are a paycheck away from acute poverty and homelessness. Long and unpredictable hours with insufficient pay is a bitter existence of hard service and anxiety. Congress must finally prioritize these most vulnerable workers and alleviate their suffering.

NETWORK Lobby will be highlighting this week's floor votes on HR 582 in our annual voting record. One of two outcomes will take place: either the House will rally to pass an increase in the minimum wage or it will fail to do so. This vote will clearly reveal your solidarity with low-income workers—a no vote or support of a Motion to Recommit (MTR) is your denial of workers' dignity. Now is the time to demonstrate that low wage workers have value and deserve dignity in our national economic priorities. NETWORK Lobby urges Congress to vote for the Raise the Wage Act of 2019 as brought to the floor by Leadership and to vote NO on any MTR that may be offered.

Sincerely,

SISTER QUINCY HOWARD, OP,
NETWORK Lobby for Catholic Social Justice.

AMERICANS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION,
July 15, 2019.

U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: As Americans for Democratic Action, we urge you to vote in favor of H.R. 582, the Raise the Wage Act. The last time the Federal minimum wage increased was July 24, 2009. Sunday, June 16th, marked the longest period since the Federal minimum wage was instituted that it hasn't been raised. It is with this in mind that a

new sense of urgency to change must be instilled.

The Raise the Wage Act Would:

Lift pay for tens of millions of workers and reverse decades of growing pay inequality;

Favor all low wage workers, only 10 percent of which being teenagers and restaurant workers;

Be particularly significant for workers of color, as 38 percent of African Americans and 33 percent of Latinos would see a wage increase;

Divert reliance on safety-net programs, which reduces burden on the taxpayer;

Raise wages for jobs considered to be mid-level class, including nearly one third of manufacturing workers, one fifth of construction workers, one sixth of educators, and one fourth of health care workers

It is critical that you vote in favor of the Raise the Wage Act as it comes to the floor this week and reject any Motions to Recommit. This legislation would provide numerous benefits to the working people of America, which underscores the importance of passing the bill as written. With wage stagnation surpassing record levels, voting yes on the Raise the Wage Act will provide long overdue relief to those who work but struggle to make ends meet. Please vote yes to raise the wage and improve the lives of millions of Americans.

Sincerely,

DON KUSLER,
*National Director,
Americans for Democratic Action.*

NATIONAL EMPLOYMENT LAWYERS
ASSOCIATION
July 15, 2019.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the National Employment Lawyers Association (NELA), I am writing to express our strong support for, and to urge you to vote in favor of, passage of the Raise the Wage Act (H.R. 582). In order to gain passage of the strongest bill possible, we ask that you oppose any motion to recommit and any amendment that would weaken this bill when the bill is brought to a vote on the House floor.

NELA advances workers' rights and serves lawyers who advocate for equality and justice in the American workplace. With members in every state, NELA is the country's largest professional organization exclusively comprised of lawyers who represent individual employees in employment discrimination cases and other employment-related matters. NELA and our 69 state and local affiliates have more than 4,000 members across our nation. Our members are private civil

rights lawyers whose clients suffer the practical realities of an insufficient, inconsistent minimum wage.

The Raise the Wage Act is long-overdue. If passed, it will address the reality of stagnated wages and income inequality brought about, in part, by an outdated federal minimum wage that has not been raised in ten years. The current federal minimum wage of \$7.25/hr is worth 17% less than it was ten years ago. For a full-time, year-round minimum wage worker, this represents a loss of over \$3,000 in annual earnings. If passed, this much-needed bill would raise the federal minimum wage to \$8.55 this year and increase it over the next five years until it reaches \$15 an hour in 2024. The Raise the Wage Act also includes common sense language to adjust the minimum wage each year after 2024. It would phase out the subminimum wage for tipped workers, which has been frozen at a meager \$2.13 since 1991, and sunset the ability of employers to pay a subminimum wage to people with disabilities and workers under the age of twenty.

According to a recent Congressional Budget Office (CBO) Report, gradually raising the federal minimum wage will lift pay for nearly 27.3 million workers by 2024 and reduce the number of people living in poverty by 1.3 million. Nearly half of the 1.3 million people who would be raised out of poverty are children under the age of eighteen. The CBO study concurs that the benefits of this legislation outweigh its costs, and that passage of the bill will leave low-wage workers and their families far better off than they are now. This bill will bolster the middle class all across the country. Many workers in sectors that are considered skilled, such as early childhood education and health care, struggle to survive on \$15 per hour. Passage of a clean bill will lift those across the bottom of the workforce.

Tens of millions of workers in America currently cannot afford basic living expenses for themselves and the families they support. These same workers stock our grocery stores, fulfill our online purchases, clean offices and homes, and perform thousands of other jobs that make every aspect of the lives of higher wage earners function. These workers are your constituents, and they deserve a raise. We urge you to pass the Raise the Wage Act now.

Sincerely,

TERRY O'NEILL,
Executive Director.

RECOGNIZING LYNETTE LACKEY

HON. VAN TAYLOR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 2019

Mr. TAYLOR. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mrs. Lynette Lackey for her thirty-five years of dedicated service to the federal government and to the North Texas veterans community.

Mrs. Lackey began her career with the United States Army Corps of Engineers at Lake Texoma prior to transferring to the Sam Rayburn Memorial Veterans Center in Bonham, Texas, where she worked in various administrative positions. Eventually, Lynette would be assigned as the Congressional Liaison for the VA North Texas Health Care System, the second largest VA health care system in the country. As the assigned Congressional Liaison for the fourteen Congressional offices in the system, Lynette was responsible for responding to inquiries from a served population of over 134,000 veterans, over thirty-eight Texas counties and two counties in southern Oklahoma.

Lynette is often lauded throughout the region for her efforts to assist veterans, their families, and Congressional staff in navigating the often-complicated VA healthcare system. Mrs. Lackey consistently strives to solve the most complex veteran issues, always with the focus of providing the best possible outcomes for those she serves. Lynette has justifiably earned the respect and admiration of her colleagues in the community.

Now as Mrs. Lackey prepares to enjoy her well-deserved retirement, she looks forward to spending more time with her husband of thirty-eight years, Dean, and her children, Jack and Aubrun, and Cole and Leslie. Lynette also anticipates welcoming her first grandchild this fall, taking on the title of "Lolly" and becoming part of the "Lolly and Pop" duo of love and support surely to surround their newest addition.

The North Texas veteran's community and all those who have had the honor of working with her over the past twenty-two years, thank Mrs. Lynette Lackey for her steadfast service and wish her the best in her retirement.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate confirmed the nomination of Mark T. Esper, of Virginia, to be Secretary of Defense.

Senate passed H.R. 1327, Never Forget the Heroes: James Zadroga, Ray Pfeifer, and Luis Alvarez Permanent Authorization of the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund Act.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S4983–S5025

Measures Introduced: Forty bills and three resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 2203–2242, and S. Res. 280–282. **Pages S5011–13**

Measures Reported:

Report to accompany S. 349, to require the Secretary of Transportation to request nominations for, and make determinations regarding, roads to be designated under the national scenic byways program. (S. Rept. No. 116–61)

Report to accompany S. 1014, to establish the Route 66 Centennial Commission. (S. Rept. No. 116–62)

Report to accompany S. 1689, to permit States to transfer certain funds from the clean water revolving fund of a State to the drinking water revolving fund of the State in certain circumstances. (S. Rept. No. 116–63)

Report to accompany S. 1833, to transfer a bridge over the Wabash River to the New Harmony River Bridge Authority and the New Harmony and Wabash River Bridge Authority. (S. Rept. No. 116–64)

S. 1883, to improve the prohibitions on money laundering, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. **Page S5011**

Measures Passed:

Never Forget the Heroes: James Zadroga, Ray Pfeifer, and Luis Alvarez Permanent Authorization of the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund Act: By 97 yeas to 2 nays (Vote No. 224), Senate passed H.R. 1327, to extend authorization for the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of

2001 through fiscal year 2092, after taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto:

Pages S4986–93, S4994–98

Rejected:

By 32 yeas to 66 nays (Vote No. 222), Lee Amendment No. 928, to limit the amount available for the Victims Compensation Fund. (Pursuant to the order of Thursday, July 18, 2019, the amendment having failed to achieve 60 affirmative votes, was not agreed to.) **Pages S4997–98**

By 22 yeas to 77 nays (Vote No. 223), Paul Amendment No. 929, to require a sequestration of certain direct spending. (Pursuant to the order of Thursday, July 18, 2019, the amendment having failed to achieve 60 affirmative votes, was not agreed to.) **Pages S4996–98**

Honoring former Associate Justice John Paul Stevens: Senate agreed to S. Res. 282, honoring former Associate Justice John Paul Stevens of the Supreme Court of the United States. **Pages S5000–01**

National Day of the American Cowboy: Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 265, designating July 27, 2019, as “National Day of the American Cowboy”, and the resolution was then agreed to. **Page S5018**

National Whistleblower Appreciation Day: Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 194, designating July 30, 2019, as “National Whistleblower Appreciation Day”, and the resolution was then agreed to. **Pages S5018–19**

Dickson Nomination—Agreement: Senate resumed consideration of the nomination of Stephen M. Dickson, of Georgia, to be Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration. **Page S4993**

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 52 yeas to 45 nays (Vote No. EX. 221), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination. **Page S4993**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that notwithstanding Rule XXII, the post-cloture time on the nomination expire at 11 a.m., on Wednesday, July 24, 2019; that following disposition of the nomination, Senate vote on the motions to invoke cloture on the nominations of Wendy Williams Berger, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida, and Brian C. Buescher, of Nebraska, to be United States District Judge for the District of Nebraska; and that if cloture is invoked, Senate vote on confirmation of the nominations in the order listed at 3 p.m. **Page S5009**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the nomination, post-cloture, at approximately 9:30 a.m., on Wednesday, July 24, 2019. **Page S5019**

Nomination Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nomination:

By 90 yeas to 8 nays (Vote No. EX. 220), Mark T. Esper, of Virginia, to be Secretary of Defense.

Pages S4993, S5025

Nomination Received: Senate received the following nomination:

David L. Norquist, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary of Defense. **Page S5025**

Messages from the House: **Page S5011**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S5013–15**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S5015–16**

Additional Statements: **Pages S5010–11**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S5018**

Record Votes: Five record votes were taken today. (Total—224) **Pages S4993, S4998**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 7:51 p.m., until 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, July 24, 2019. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S5019.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

CHALLENGES FOR CANNABIS AND BANKING

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine chal-

lenges for cannabis and banking, focusing on outside perspectives, after receiving testimony from Senators Gardner and Merkley; Rachel Pross, Maps Credit Union, Salem, Oregon, on behalf of the Credit Union National Association; Garth Van Meter, Smart Approaches to Marijuana, Alexandria, Virginia; and Joanne Sherwood, American Bankers Association, and John Lord, LivWell Enlightened Health, both of Denver, Colorado.

WORKING WATERFRONTS

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Science, Oceans, Fisheries, and Weather concluded a hearing to examine America's waterfronts, focusing on addressing economic, recreational, and environmental challenges, after receiving testimony from Mayor Eric Genrich, Green Bay, Wisconsin; Michael J. Friis, Wisconsin Department of Administration Coastal Management Program, Madison; Lynn Clark, Historic Arkansas Riverwalk of Pueblo, Pueblo, Colorado; and Monty Graham, University of Southern Mississippi, Long Beach.

FREELY ASSOCIATED STATES

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the United States' interests in the Freely Associated States, after receiving testimony from Douglas Domenech, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Insular and International Affairs; Randall G. Schriver, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Indo-Pacific Security Affairs; Sandra Oudkirk, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Australia, New Zealand, and Pacific Islands, Bureau of East Asian and Pacific Affairs; and David Gootnick, Director, International Affairs and Trade, Government Accountability Office.

ELDER JUSTICE REFORM

Committee on Finance: Committee concluded a hearing to examine promoting elder justice, focusing on a call for reform, after receiving testimony from Megan H. Tinker, Senior Advisor for Legal Affairs, Office of Counsel to the Inspector General, Office of the Inspector General, Department of Health and Human Services; John E. Dicken, Director, Health Care, Government Accountability Office; and Robert B. Blancato, Elder Justice Coalition, Mark Parkinson, American Health Care Association, and Lori Smetanka, National Consumer Voice for Quality Long-Term Care, all of Washington, D.C.

FBI OVERSIGHT

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded an oversight hearing to examine the Federal Bureau of Investigation, after receiving testimony from Christopher Wray, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee held closed hearings on intelligence matters, receiving testimony from officials of the intelligence community.

Committee recessed subject to the call.

BUSINESS MEETING

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee met in closed session to consider pending intelligence matters.

Committee recessed subject to the call.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 51 public bills, H.R. 3876–3926; and 7 resolutions, H. Res. 507–508, 510–514 were introduced.

Pages H7239–42

Additional Cosponsors:

Pages H7243–45

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 2942, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out the Women's Health Transition Training pilot program through at least fiscal year 2020, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 116–166, Part 1);

H.R. 1307, to provide for an online repository for certain reporting requirements for recipients of Federal disaster assistance, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 116–167, Part 1);

H.R. 549, to designate Venezuela under section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to permit nationals of Venezuela to be eligible for temporary protected status under such section, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 116–168);

H.R. 2938, to exempt from the calculation of monthly income certain benefits paid by the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Department of Defense (H. Rept. 116–169);

H.R. 3304, to exempt for an additional 4-year period, from the application of the means-test presumption of abuse under chapter 7, qualifying members of reserve components of the Armed Forces and members of the National Guard who, after September 11, 2001, are called to active duty or to perform a homeland defense activity for not less than 90 days (H. Rept. 116–170);

H.R. 3311, to amend chapter 11 of title 11, United States Code, to address reorganization of small businesses, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 116–171);

H.R. 3409, to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 116–172);

H.R. 3375, to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to clarify the prohibitions on making robocalls, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 116–173);

H.R. 2507, to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize certain programs under part A of title XI of such Act relating to genetic diseases, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 116–174);

H.R. 2035, to amend title XXIX of the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the program under such title relating to lifespan respite care, with an amendment (H. Rept. 116–175);

H.R. 776, to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the Emergency Medical Services for Children program (H. Rept. 116–176);

H.R. 1058, to reauthorize certain provisions of the Public Health Service Act relating to autism, and for other purposes, with amendments (H. Rept. 116–177); and

H. Res. 509, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 397) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to create a Pension Rehabilitation Trust Fund, to establish a Pension Rehabilitation Administration within the Department of the Treasury to make loans to multiemployer defined benefit plans, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3239) to require U.S. Customs and Border Protection to perform an initial health screening on detainees, and for other purposes; providing for proceedings during the period from July 29, 2019, through September 6, 2019; and for other purposes (H. Rept. 116–178).

Page H7239

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Dean to act as Speaker pro tempore for today.

Page H7163

Recess: The House recessed at 12:23 p.m. and reconvened at 2 p.m.

Page H7165

Journal: The House agreed to the Speaker's approval of the Journal by voice vote.

Pages H7166, H7224

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Building Blocks of STEM Act: H.R. 1665, to direct the National Science Foundation to support STEM education research focused on early childhood;

Pages H7166–68

American Manufacturing Leadership Act: H.R. 2397, amended, to amend the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act to make changes to the implementation of the network for manufacturing innovation;

Pages H7168–72

Agreed to amend the title so as to read: “To amend the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act to make changes to the implementation of the Manufacturing USA Network, and for other purposes”;

Page H7172

Expanding Findings for Federal Opioid Research and Treatment Act: H.R. 3153, to direct the Director of the National Science Foundation to support research on opioid addiction;

Pages H7172–73

Combating Sexual Harassment in Science Act of 2019: H.R. 36, amended, to provide for research to better understand the causes and consequences of sexual harassment affecting individuals in the scientific, technical, engineering, and mathematics workforce and to examine policies to reduce the prevalence and negative impact of such harassment;

Pages H7173–76

Vera Rubin Survey Telescope Designation Act: H.R. 3196, amended, to designate the Large Synoptic Survey Telescope as the “Vera Rubin Survey Telescope”;

Pages H7176–77

Agreed to amend the title so as to read: “To designate the Large Synoptic Survey Telescope as the ‘Vera C. Rubin Observatory’”;

Page H7177

Energy and Water Research Integration Act of 2019: H.R. 34, amended, to ensure consideration of water intensity in the Department of Energy’s energy research, development, and demonstration programs to help guarantee efficient, reliable, and sustainable delivery of energy and clean water resources;

Pages H7177–79

Department of Energy Veterans’ Health Initiative Act: H.R. 617, amended, to authorize the Department of Energy to conduct collaborative research with the Department of Veterans Affairs in order to improve healthcare services for veterans in the United States;

Pages H7179–81

Opposing efforts to delegitimize the State of Israel and the Global Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions Movement targeting Israel: H. Res. 246, amended, opposing efforts to delegitimize the State of Israel and the Global Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions Movement targeting Israel, by a $\frac{2}{3}$ ye-

and-nay vote of 398 yeas to 17 nays with five answering “present”, Roll No. 497;

Pages H7181–88, H7222

United States-Israel Cooperation Enhancement and Regional Security Act: H.R. 1837, amended, to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions and to authorize assistance for Israel;

Pages H7188–98

Palestinian International Terrorism Support Prevention Act of 2019: H.R. 1850, amended, to impose sanctions with respect to foreign support for Palestinian terrorism;

Pages H7198–H7202

Calling on the Government of Cameroon and armed groups to respect the human rights of all Cameroonian citizens, to end all violence, and to pursue a broad-based dialogue without preconditions to resolve the conflict in the Northwest and Southwest regions: H. Res. 358, calling on the Government of Cameroon and armed groups to respect the human rights of all Cameroonian citizens, to end all violence, and to pursue a broad-based dialogue without preconditions to resolve the conflict in the Northwest and Southwest regions;

Pages H7203–04

Providing Benefits Information in Spanish and Tagalog for Veterans and Families Act: H.R. 2943, amended, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to make all fact sheets of the Department of Veterans Affairs in English and Spanish;

Pages H7204–06

Agreed to amend the title so as to read: “To direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to make all fact sheets of the Department of Veterans Affairs in English, Spanish, and Tagalog”;

Page H7206

Directing the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out the Women’s Health Transition Training pilot program through at least fiscal year 2020: H.R. 2942, amended, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out the Women’s Health Transition Training pilot program through at least fiscal year 2020;

Pages H7206–07

Ryan Kules Specially Adaptive Housing Improvement Act of 2019: H.R. 3504, amended, to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for improvements to the specially adapted housing program of the Department of Veterans Affairs;

Pages H7207–11

Honoring American Veterans in Extreme Need Act of 2019: H.R. 2938, amended, to exempt from the calculation of monthly income certain benefits paid by the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Department of Defense;

Pages H7215–16

National Guard and Reservists Debt Relief Extension Act of 2019: H.R. 3304, amended, to exempt for an additional 4-year period, from the application of the means-test presumption of abuse under chapter 7, qualifying members of reserve components of the Armed Forces and members of the National Guard who, after September 11, 2001, are called to active duty or to perform a homeland defense activity for not less than 90 days, by a $\frac{2}{3}$ ye-and-nay vote of 417 yeas to 1 nay, Roll No. 499;

Pages H7216–17, H7223–24

Small Business Reorganization Act of 2019: H.R. 3311, amended, to amend chapter 11 of title 11, United States Code, to address reorganization of small businesses; and

Page H7217–20

Let Everyone Get Involved in Opportunities for National Service Act: S. 504, to amend title 36, United States Code, to authorize The American Legion to determine the requirements for membership in The American Legion.

Pages H7220–22

Suspensions: The House failed to agree to suspend the rules and pass the following measure:

Venezuela TPS Act of 2019: H.R. 549, amended, to designate Venezuela under section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to permit nationals of Venezuela to be eligible for temporary protected status under such section, by a $\frac{2}{3}$ ye-and-nay vote of 268 yeas to 154 nays, Roll No. 498.

Pages H7211–15, H7222–23

Announcement by the Chair: The Chair informed the House that, pursuant to H. Res. 497, the Speaker has certified to the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia the refusal of William P. Barr and Wilbur L. Ross, Jr., to produce documents to the Committee on Oversight and Reform. Page H7227

Senate Referral: S. 1199 was held at the desk.

Senate Messages: Message received from the Senate today and message received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today appear on pages H7181 and H7202–03.

Quorum Calls Votes: Three ye-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H7222, H7222–23 and H7223–24. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 12 noon and adjourned at 9:35 p.m.

Committee Meetings

RESTORING THE PARTNERSHIP: THE FUTURE OF FEDERALISM IN AMERICA

Committee on Oversight and Reform: Subcommittee on Government Operations held a hearing entitled “Re-

storing the Partnership: The Future of Federalism in America”. Testimony was heard from Representative Bishop of Utah; and public witnesses.

REHABILITATION FOR MULTIEMPLOYER PENSIONS ACT OF 2019; HUMANITARIAN STANDARDS FOR INDIVIDUALS IN CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION CUSTODY ACT

Committee on Rules: Full Committee held a hearing on H.R. 397, the “Rehabilitation for Multiemployer Pensions Act of 2019”; and H.R. 3239, the “Humanitarian Standards for Individuals in Customs and Border Protection Custody Act”. The Committee granted, by record vote of 9–4, a rule providing for consideration of H.R. 397, the “Rehabilitation for Multiemployer Pensions Act”, and H.R. 3239, the “Humanitarian Standards for Individuals in Customs and Border Protection Custody Act”. The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 397, the “Rehabilitation for Multiemployer Pensions Act”, under a structured rule. The rule provides one hour of debate equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule provides that an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116–24 shall be considered as adopted and the bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended. The rule makes in order the further amendment printed in Part A of the report, if offered by the member designated in the report, which shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. The rule waives all points of order against the amendment printed in part A of the report. The rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. The rule also provides for consideration of H.R. 3239, the “Humanitarian Standards for Individuals in Customs and Border Protection Custody Act”, under a structured rule. The rule provides one hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule makes in order as original text for the purpose of amendment an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116–26 modified by the amendment printed in Part B of the report, and provides that it

shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute. The rule makes in order only those further amendments printed in part C of the Rules Committee report. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. The rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in part C of the report. The rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. The rule provides that House Resolution 507 is hereby adopted. The rule provides that it shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of July 25, 2019, or July 26, 2019, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV. The Speaker or her designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or his designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this section. Section 5 of the rule provides that on any legislative day during the period from July 29, 2019, through September 6, 2019: the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day shall be considered as approved; and the Chair may at any time declare the House adjourned to meet at a date and time to be announced by the Chair in declaring the adjournment. The rule provides that the Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 5 of the resolution. Finally, the rule provides that each day during the period addressed by section 5 of the resolution: shall not constitute a calendar day for the purposes of section 7 of the War Powers Resolution; shall not constitute a legislative day for the purposes of clause 7 of rule XIII; and shall not constitute a legislative day for the purposes of clause 7 of rule XV. Testimony was heard from Chairman Neal, Chairman Scott of Virginia, Chairman Lofgren, and Representatives Brady of Texas, Foxx of North Carolina, Grothman, Estes, and Collins of Georgia.

LEARNING FROM WHISTLEBLOWERS AT THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations concluded a hearing entitled "Learning from Whistleblowers at the Department of Veterans Affairs". Testimony was heard from Tamar Bonzanto, Assistant Secretary for Accountability and Whistleblower Protection, Department of Veterans Affairs; Michael Missal, Inspector General, Department of Veterans Affairs; Henry Kerner, Spe-

cial Counsel, U.S. Office of Special Counsel; Tristan Leavitt, General Counsel/Acting Chief Executive and Administrative Officer, Merit Systems Protection Board; and public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

ENERGY AND POWER IN EUROPE

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe: Commission received a briefing on pipeline politics, focusing on energy and power in Europe from Colin Cleary, Director for Energy Diplomacy for Europe, Western Hemisphere and Africa, Department of State; Ed Chow, Center for Strategic and International Studies, and David Koranyi, Atlantic Council, both of Washington, D.C.; and Efgan Nifti, Caspian Policy Center, Arlington, Virginia.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY, JULY 24, 2019

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Armed Services: to hold hearings to examine the expected nomination of David L. Norquist to be Deputy Secretary of Defense, 10 a.m., SD-G50.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: business meeting to consider S. 496, to preserve United States fishing heritage through a national program dedicated to training and assisting the next generation of commercial fishermen, S. 893, to require the President to develop a strategy to ensure the security of next generation mobile telecommunications systems and infrastructure in the United States and to assist allies and strategic partners in maximizing the security of next generation mobile telecommunications systems, infrastructure, and software, S. 1148, to amend title 49, United States Code, to require the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to give preferential consideration to individuals who have successfully completed air traffic controller training and veterans when hiring air traffic control specialists, S. 1341, to adopt a certain California flammability standard as a Federal flammability standard to protect against the risk of upholstered furniture flammability, S. 1349, to expand enrollment in TSA PreCheck to expedite commercial travel screening and improve airport security, S. 1625, to promote the deployment of commercial fifth-generation mobile networks and the sharing of information with communications providers in the United States regarding security risks to the networks of those providers, S. 1822, to require the Federal Communications Commission to issue rules relating to the collection of data with respect to the availability of broadband services, S. 1858, to ensure the Chief Information Office of the Consumer Product Safety Commission has a significant role in decisions related to information technology, proposed legislation entitled, "Regional Ocean Partnership

Act”, S. 2035, to require the Transportation Security Administration to develop a strategic plan to expand eligibility for the PreCheck Program to individuals with Transportation Worker Identification Credentials or Hazardous Materials Endorsements, S. 2134, to extend the transfer of Electronic Travel Authorization System fees from the Travel Promotion Fund to the Corporation for Travel Promotion (Brand USA) through fiscal year 2027, and a promotion list in the Coast Guard; to be immediately followed by hearings to examine the nominations of Theodore Rokita, of Indiana, to be a Director of the Amtrak Board of Directors, Jennifer L. Homendy, of Virginia, and Michael Graham, of Kansas, both to be a Member of the National Transportation Safety Board, Carl Whitney Bentzel, of Maryland, to be a Federal Maritime Commissioner, Michael J.K. Kratsios, of South Carolina, to be an Associate Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, and Ian Paul Steff, of Indiana, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce and Director General of the United States and Foreign Commercial Service, 10:30 a.m., SH–216.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: to hold hearings to examine the Theodore Roosevelt Genius Prize, focusing on innovative solutions to reduce human-predator conflict, 10 a.m., SD–406.

Committee on Finance: to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Brent James McIntosh, of Michigan, to be an Under Secretary, Brian Callanan, of New Jersey, to be General Counsel, and Brian McGuire, of New York, to be a Deputy Under Secretary, all of the Department of the Treasury, and Travis Greaves, of the District of Columbia, to be a Judge of the United States Tax Court for a term of fifteen years, 10:15 a.m., SD–215.

Committee on Foreign Relations: to hold hearings to examine authorities for the use of military force, 10:15 a.m., SD–419.

Subcommittee on Africa and Global Health Policy, to hold hearings to examine confronting Ebola, focusing on addressing a 21st century global health crisis, 2:30 p.m., SD–419.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: business meeting to consider S. 2162, to require the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to annually hire at least 600 new Border Patrol agents, to report quarterly to Congress on the status of the Border Patrol workforce, and to conduct a comprehensive staffing analysis, S. 1976, to amend the FAST Act to improve the Federal permitting process, S. 2065, to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to publish an annual report on the use of deepfake technology, S. 2183, to require the Comptroller General of the United States to analyze certain legislation in order prevent duplication of and overlap with existing Federal programs, offices, and initiatives, S. 2177, to provide taxpayers with an improved understanding of Government programs through the disclosure of cost, performance, and areas of duplication among them, leverage existing data to achieve a functional Federal program inventory, S. 2169, to amend section 3116 of title 5, United States Code, to clarify the applicability of the appointment limitations for students appointed under the expedited hiring authority for post-secondary

students, S. 2107, to increase the number of CBP Agriculture Specialists and support staff in the Office of Field Operations of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, S. 2193, to require the Administrator of General Services to issue guidance to clarify that Federal agencies may pay by charge card for the charging of Federal electric motor vehicles, S. 764, to provide for congressional approval of national emergency declarations, S. 439, to allow Members of Congress to opt out of the Federal Employees Retirement System, and allow Members who opt out of the Federal Employees Retirement System to continue to participate in the Thrift Savings Plan, S. 2119, to amend title 5, United States Code, to appropriately limit the authority to award bonuses to Federal employees, H.R. 2590, to require a Department of Homeland Security overseas personnel enhancement plan, H.R. 3305, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2509 George Mason Drive in Virginia Beach, Virginia, as the “Ryan Keith Cox Post Office Building”, and the nominations of Chad F. Wolf, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary for Strategy, Policy, and Plans, and William Bryan, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary for Science and Technology, both of the Department of Homeland Security, Robert M. Duncan, of Kentucky, to be a Governor of the United States Postal Service, Ann C. Fisher, of the District of Columbia, and Ashley Jay Elizabeth Poling, of North Carolina, both to be a Commissioner of the Postal Regulatory Commission, Catherine Bird, of Texas, to be General Counsel of the Federal Labor Relations Authority, and Rainey R. Brandt, and Shana Frost Matini, both to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia, 9:30 a.m., SD–342.

Committee on Indian Affairs: business meeting to consider S. 2159, to repeal the Act entitled “An Act to confer jurisdiction on the State of North Dakota over offenses committed by or against Indians on the Devils Lake Indian Reservation”; to be immediately followed by a hearing to examine the nomination of E. Sequoyah Simermeyer, of Maryland, to be Chairman of the National Indian Gaming Commission, 2:30 p.m., SD–628.

Committee on Rules and Administration: to hold an oversight hearing to examine the Government Publishing Office, Office of the Inspector General, 11 a.m., SR–301.

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship: business meeting to markup an original bill entitled, “Small Business Administration Reauthorization Act”, 2:30 p.m., S–115, Capitol.

House

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies, hearing entitled “Oversight of the Unaccompanied Children Program: Ensuring the Safety of Children in HHS Care”, 9 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies, budget and oversight hearing on the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy, 10:15 a.m., 2358–A Rayburn.

Subcommittee on the Department of Homeland Security, oversight hearing on the U.S. Customs and Border Protection—Border Patrol, 2 p.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies, hearing entitled “Bureau of Indian Education, Education Construction”, 3 p.m., 2008 Rayburn.

Committee on the Budget, Full Committee, hearing entitled “The Costs of Climate Change: From Coasts to Heartland, Health to Security”, 10 a.m., 210 Cannon.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Environment and Climate Change, hearing entitled “Building America’s Clean Future: Pathways to Decarbonize the Economy”, 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Consumer Protection and Commerce, hearing entitled “Legislation to Make Cars in America Safer”, 10:30 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Full Committee, hearing entitled “The Next Megabank? Examining the Proposed Merger of SunTrust and BB&T”, 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee on the Middle East, North Africa, and International Terrorism, hearing entitled “The FY20 Budget: State Department Counterterrorism and Countering Violent Extremism Bureau”, 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on the Judiciary, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Oversight of the Report on the Investigation into Russian Interference in the 2016 Presidential Election: Former Special Counsel Robert S. Mueller, III”, 8:30 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources, hearing on H.R. 934, the “Health Benefits for Miners Act of 2019”; and H.R. 935, the “Miners Pension Protection Act”, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled “The Status of the Reclamation Fund and the Bureau of Reclamation’s Future Infrastructure Funding Needs”, 2 p.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Reform, Subcommittee on Economic and Consumer Policy, hearing entitled “Exam-

ining JUUL’s Role in the Youth Nicotine Epidemic: Part I”, 9 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Civil Rights and Civil Liberties, hearing entitled “Beyond the Citizenship Question: Repairing the Damage and Preparing to Count ‘We the People’”, 2 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Environment, hearing entitled “The Devil They Knew—PFAS Contamination and the Need for Corporate Accountability”, 2 p.m., 2247 Rayburn.

Committee on Rules, Full Committee, hearing on H.R. 2203, the “Homeland Security Improvement Act”; and H.R. 3877, the “Bipartisan Budget Act of 2019”, 3 p.m., H-313 Capitol.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 3597, the “Solar Energy Research and Development Act of 2019”; H.R. 3607, the “Fossil Energy Research and Development Act of 2019”; H.R. 3609, the “Wind Energy Research and Development Act of 2019”; and H.R. 335, the “South Florida Clean Coastal Waters Act of 2019”, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Is the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act a Help or Hinderance to Main Street?”, 11:30 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, Full Committee, hearing entitled “True Transparency? Assessing Wait Times Five Years after Phoenix”, 10 a.m., HVC-210.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Former Special Counsel Robert S. Mueller, III on the Investigation into Russian Interference in the 2016 Presidential Election”, 12 p.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Select Committee on the Modernization of Congress, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Modernizing Legislative Information Technologies: Lessons from the States”, 2 p.m., 2020 Rayburn.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Wednesday, July 24

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Wednesday, July 24

Senate Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Senate will continue consideration of the nomination of Stephen M. Dickson, of Georgia, to be Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, post-cloture, and vote on confirmation of the nomination at 11 a.m.

Following disposition of the nomination of Stephen M. Dickson, Senate will vote on the motions to invoke cloture on the nominations of Wendy Williams Berger, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida, and Brian C. Buescher, of Nebraska, to be United States District Judge for the District of Nebraska. If cloture is invoked, Senate will vote on confirmation of the nominations at 3 p.m.

House Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Consideration of measures under suspension of the Rules.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Babin, Brian, Tex., E958
Carter, John R., Tex., E961
Castor, Kathy, Fla., E964
Correa, J. Luis, Calif., E964
Courtney, Joe, Conn., E964
DeFazio, Peter A., Ore., E961
Diaz-Balart, Mario, Fla., E960
Gianforte, Greg, Mont., E963
Gooden, Lance, Tex., E963
Gosar, Paul, Ariz., E957, E961

Graves, Sam, Mo., E963
Horn, Kendra S., Okla., E959
Levin, Mike, Calif., E966
Massie, Thomas, Ky., E964
McCollum, Betty, Minn., E959
Meng, Grace, N.Y., E965
Norton, Eleanor Holmes, The District of Columbia, E958, E962
Olson, Pete, Tex., E959, E960, E961, E962, E964, E965, E966
Payne, Donald M., Jr., N.J., E962
Perry, Scott, Pa., E963

Reed, Tom, N.Y., E965
Schiff, Adam B., Calif., E959
Scott, Robert C. "Bobby", Va., E966
Swalwell, Eric, Calif., E963
Taylor, Van, Tex., E969
Thompson, Mike, Calif., E962
Velázquez, Nydia M., N.Y., E958
Waltz, Michael, Fla., E961
Westerman, Bruce, Ark., E958
Wittman, Robert J., Va., E960



Congressional Record

printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at www.govinfo.gov, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202-512-1800, or 866-512-1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, contactcenter@gpo.gov. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197-9000, or phone orders to 866-512-1800 (toll-free), 202-512-1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202-512-2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.